

**PX-001**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division

Mark Lenzi, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) Case No.  
v. )  
) 1:21-cv-01371-PTG-IDD  
United States Department )  
of State, and Antony J. )  
Blinken, United States )  
Secretary of State, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
-----X

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JOHN EDMUND FITZSIMMONS  
Thursday, November 17, 2022; 9:07 a.m. EST

Reported by: Cindy L. Sebo, RMR, CRR, RPR, CSR, CCR,  
CLR, RSA, California Shorthand Reporter #14409, NYRCR,  
NYACR, Remote Counsel Reporter, LiveDeposition  
Authorized Reporter  
Job No. 877548

1                   Videotaped Deposition of JOHN EDMUND  
2     FITZSIMMONS, held at the law offices of Steptoe &  
3     Johnson LLP, 1330 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest,  
4     Washington, D.C. 20036, before Cindy L. Sebo,  
5     Registered Merit Court Reporter, Certified Real-Time  
6     Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified  
7     Shorthand Reporter, Certified Court Reporter,  
8     Certified LiveNote Reporter, Real-Time Systems  
9     Administrator, California Shorthand Reporter #14409,  
10    New York Realtime Certified Reporter, New York  
11    Association Certified Reporter, Remote Counsel  
12    Reporter, LiveDeposition Authorized Reporter and  
13    Notary Public, beginning at approximately 9:07 a.m.  
14    EST, when were present on behalf of the respective  
15    parties:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 Attorneys for the Plaintiff:

3 STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

4 CHRISTOPHER A. SUAREZ, ESQUIRE

5 THOMAS M. BARBA, ESQUIRE

6 1330 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest

7 Washington, D.C. 20036

8 202.429.3000

9 csuarez@steptoe.com

10 tbarba@steptoe.com

11

Attorney for the Defendants:

12

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES

13

MATTHEW MEZGER, ESQUIRE

14

2100 Jamieson Avenue

15

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

16

703.299.3700

17

matthew.mezger@usdoj.gov

18

19 ALSO PRESENT:

20 JONATHAN PERRY, Videographer

21 JASON ROBERTS, State Department

22 CHRISTINE HOULE

1 --oOo--

2 INDEX OF EXAMINATION

3 JOHN EDMUND FITZSIMMONS

4 Lenzi v. United States, et al.

5 Thursday, November 17, 2022

6 CINDY L. SEBO, RMR, CRR, RPR, CSR, CCR, CLR,

RSA, California Shorthand Reporter #14409,

7 NYRCR, NYACR, Remote Counsel Reporter,

LiveDeposition Authorized Reporter

8

--oOo--

9

10	EXAMINATION BY	PAGE
11	Mr. Suarez	24, 184
12	Mr. Mezger	410

13

14

15	CONTINUED EXAMINATION BY:	PAGE
16	Mr. Suarez	415

17

18

19	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	418
----	-------------------------	-----

20	ERRATA	420
----	--------	-----

21	ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WITNESS	422
----	---------------------------	-----

22

1 --oOo--

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 --oOo--

4 --oOo--

5 Thursday, November 17, 2022; 9:07 a.m. EST

6 --oOo--

7

8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on  
9 the record.

10 This begins Videotape Number 1 in 09:06:54  
11 the deposition of John Fitzsimmons, taken  
12 in the matter of Mark Lenzi versus the  
13 United States Department of State, et al.,  
14 case filed in the U.S. District Court for  
15 the Eastern District of Virginia, 09:07:06  
16 Case Number 1:21-cv-01371-PTG-IDD.

17 Today's date is November 17th,  
18 2022. The time is 9:07 a.m.

19 We are at the offices of Steptoe &  
20 Johnson, 1330 Connecticut Avenue, 09:07:25  
21 Northwest, in Washington, D.C.

22 My name is Jonathan Perry. I'm the

1 videographer from Magna Legal Services, and 09:07:32  
2 the court reporter is Cindy Sebo, also with  
3 Magna Legal Services.

4 And will counsel please -- please  
5 introduce themselves and state whom they 09:07:41  
6 represent?

7 MR. SUAREZ: Good morning. This is  
8 Christopher Suarez from Steptoe & Johnson  
9 on behalf of the Plaintiff, Mr. Lenzi.

10 With me is Tom Barba, also of 09:07:51  
11 Steptoe.

12 MR. MEZGER: Matthew Mezger on  
13 behalf of the witness and Defendants.

14 I'm joined by Jason Roberts of the  
15 State Department, as well as 09:08:01  
16 Christine Houle.

17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: And will the  
18 reporter swear in the witness, please?

19 --oOo--

20 JOHN EDMUND FITZSIMMONS, 09:08:06  
21 after having been first duly sworn remotely  
22 by the certified stenographer to tell the truth,

1 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, 09:08:06

2 testified remotely as follows:

3 --oOo--

4 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: The

5 witness is sworn. 09:08:26

6 --oOo--

7 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF

8 --oOo--

9 BY MR. SUAREZ:

10 Q. Okay. Good morning, 09:08:27

11 Mr. Fitzsimmons.

12 How are you?

13 A. Good morning.

14 Q. All right. So you are currently  
15 employed at the State Department; is that 09:08:33  
16 correct?

17 A. No.

18 Q. You are not.

19 Okay. So when did you leave the  
20 State Department? 09:08:37

21 A. November of 2021.

22 Q. Okay. So your last day at the



1 Diplomatic Courier Service, yes --

09:13:07

2 Q. Okay. So --

3 A. -- there's three offices.

4 Q. -- so where do -- so where do SEOs

5 fall under that?

09:13:12

6 A. Under security technology --

7 Q. I see.

8 A. -- there were a few SEOs that worked

9 in physical security programs as well.

10 Q. I see.

09:13:18

11 So most SEOs are involved in the

12 security technology aspect?

13 A. Exactly.

14 Q. Okay. And what is an SEO's role in

15 the context of security technology?

09:13:29

16 A. Security engineering officers

17 design, install, maintain technical solutions to

18 protect lives, information, property for

19 Department of State facilities.

20 Q. When you say they maintain technical 09:13:46

21 solutions, what do you mean by "technical

22 solutions"?

1 A. Possible -- 09:33:56

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. -- it could go more.

4 Q. It -- it -- I understand it could go  
5 more, but, typically, in your 30 years or so of 09:34:00

6 experience at the State Department, it would  
7 typically be less than a year, right?

8 A. Typically.

9 Q. Okay. And significantly more than  
10 50 percent of the time, it would be less than a 09:34:08  
11 year, right?

12 A. I have no information as to what the  
13 statistics on that are.

14 Q. Okay. But you would agree that  
15 typically, it would be less than a year, based on 09:34:18  
16 your personal experience?

17 A. Typically, yeah.

18 MR. SUAREZ: Okay. I'll mark

19 Exhibit 1.

20 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Thank you. 09:35:19

21 MR. SUAREZ: Yep.

22

1 satisfaction, I believe, at some point with his 09:49:25  
2 medical providers, and -- and he wanted to be  
3 relatively close to that, as I understood.

4 Q. Okay. Did you or anyone in your  
5 chain of command ever evaluate whether Monterrey 09:49:39  
6 could have medically accommodated Mr. Lenzi?

7 A. It was not my role.

8 Q. Okay. So -- so you never had anyone  
9 look into that, then?

10 A. It was not my role. 09:49:52

11 Q. Okay. So the answer to my question,  
12 then, is, you did not have anyone look into that,  
13 right?

14 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

15 The witness may answer. 09:50:01

16 THE WITNESS: I did not look into  
17 it. I'm not aware if anyone in my staff  
18 did. I did not direct anyone to look into  
19 it.

20 BY MR. SUAREZ: 09:50:15

21 Q. Got it.

22 Would you agree that several

1 A. The DS assignments panel. 09:54:24

2 Q. Right.

3 And -- and you sat on that panel,  
4 right?

5 A. I did. 09:54:29

6 Q. Okay. And you were the person who  
7 personally interceded to defer Mr. Lenzi's  
8 consideration on the Frankfurt position, right?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Now, you wouldn't dispute that 09:54:41  
11 Mr. Lenzi was qualified for that position, right?

12 A. That was an entry-level position,  
13 and Mr. Lenzi had already been in that position.  
14 Qualifications or not, it would have -- it would  
15 have essentially been a step backward for him 09:54:57  
16 careerwise.

17 Q. Okay. So you -- so the answer to my  
18 question, you don't dispute that he was qualified  
19 for the position, right?

20 A. Correct. 09:55:06

21 Q. Okay. So -- you would agree that  
22 deferrals constitute a pretty small proportion of

1           A.       I was the one that deferred, but           09:57:03

2       that's all I said.

3           Q.       Okay. So who suggested he should be

4       deferred, then, in the conversation?

5           A.       I said he should be deferred, but           09:57:11

6       there was no further discussion nor explanation.

7           Q.       I see.

8                    So during the meeting itself, you

9       just said he should be deferred?

10          A.       Right.                                   09:57:18

11          Q.       And everyone deferred to that

12       statement, correct?

13                   MR. MEZGER: Object to the form.

14                   THE WITNESS: Correct. Correct.

15       BY MR. SUAREZ:                                   09:57:29

16          Q.       Got it. Okay.

17                   And so during the meeting itself,

18       you didn't articulate a reason; the reason you

19       articulated is something you provided to me just

20       now, right?                                   09:57:37

21                   MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

22                   The witness may answer.

1 A. Right. 10:04:22

2 Q. So you don't have any personal

3 knowledge about that?

4 A. I do not --

5 MR. MEZGER: Object to form. 10:04:24

6 BY MR. SUAREZ:

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. -- I'm sorry.

9 I do not.

10 Q. Now, have you articulated all of the 10:04:33

11 reasons why you defer to Mr. Lenzi from the

12 Frankfurt position in -- that was -- he bid on in

13 2019?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. So then, to be clear, one of 10:04:43

16 the reasons that Mr. Lenzi was deferred was not

17 because he was a NOW bidder in overcomplement

18 status, correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Okay. And, indeed, the advisory 10:04:58

21 panel advanced Mr. Lenzi for that position,

22 notwithstanding the fact that he was a NOW

1 BY MR. SUAREZ:

10:16:57

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. -- I would -- fair to say that most  
4 were.

5 Q. Okay. So you would agree, then,

10:16:59

6 that most of the e-mails and speaking with the  
7 press that Mr. Lenzi conducted in 2018 or later  
8 related to the Havana Syndrome and his views and  
9 treatment by the State Department with regard to  
10 the Havana Syndrome, right?

10:17:11

11 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

12 The witness may answer.

13 THE WITNESS: That's fair.

14 BY MR. SUAREZ:

15 Q. Okay. Now, you would agree that,

10:17:16

16 you know, State Department employees have a First  
17 Amendment right to, you know, speak their views  
18 about issues that are occurring in the State  
19 Department, right?

20 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

10:17:47

21 The witness may answer.

22 THE WITNESS: Yeah, but there are

1           also policies -- established policies on           10:17:50  
2           speaking with the press.

3       BY MR. SUAREZ:

4           Q.       Understood.

5                   But if those policies run afoul, for 10:17:56  
6       example, of the person's constitutional rights,  
7       you know, that that would be a problem, right?

8           MR. MEZGER:   Object to form.

9           The witness may answer.

10           THE WITNESS:   I'm not an attorney.   10:18:06

11       BY MR. SUAREZ:

12           Q.       Okay.   Now, you -- you would agree  
13       that -- that speaking out to the press -- that --  
14       that should not be a reason to retaliate or  
15       discriminate against an employee, right?           10:18:19

16           A.       Retaliate or discriminate?

17           Q.       Yeah.

18           A.       That's fair.

19           Q.       But you would also agree that it  
20       bothered you that Mr. Lenzi frequently sent blast 10:18:35  
21       e-mails and spoke to the press about his concerns  
22       about Havana Syndrome, right?



1 MR. MEZGER: Object to the form. 10:18:49

2 The witness may answer.

3 THE WITNESS: It was -- it was also

4 the tone of the e-mails are highly

5 disrespectful to senior department 10:18:52

6 officials.

7 BY MR. SUAREZ:

8 Q. Got it.

9 Do you think it's disrespectful to

10 Mr. Lenzi to not address his needs with regard to 10:19:15

11 the Havana Syndrome?

12 A. I don't know that Mr. Lenzi's needs

13 have not been addressed.

14 Q. Okay. Do you think that an employee

15 has a right to express frustrations if they've 10:19:31

16 been aggrieved?

17 A. In the proper venue, certainly.

18 Q. Okay. So what are some of the

19 proper venues to express frustrations, in your

20 view? 10:19:42

21 A. EEO process, if that -- if, indeed,

22 that's the employee view -- views it's an EEO

1 Taplan Moore, who was, I guess, paneled to the 10:43:09  
2 Belgrade position.

3 Do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. So you -- you write that you 10:43:14  
6 have no knowledge of Taplan Moore's medical  
7 status nor EEO activity; however, Global Talent  
8 Management vets candidates for appropriate  
9 medical clearance prior to submission to the DS  
10 assignments panel. 10:43:35

11 Do you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. And so if someone has a  
14 Class 2 clearance for Belgrade, for example, you  
15 would agree that they're properly vetted from a 10:43:44  
16 medical perspective for that position, right?

17 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

18 The witness may answer.

19 THE WITNESS: Presumably.

20 BY MR. SUAREZ: 10:43:52

21 Q. Okay. So you would agree that if  
22 someone has a Class 1 clearance, which allows

1 THE WITNESS: Correct.

11:11:12

2 BY MR. SUAREZ:

3 Q. Okay. And, now, to be clear, you

4 were aware of Mr. Lenzi's disability, as you say

5 in Paragraph 9, and -- as of May 2018, right?

11:11:20

6 A. I wouldn't -- I don't know that I

7 would term it "disability." It was a medical --

8 the -- the -- the -- the "verbiage" here is

9 medical -- Complainant's medical condition or

10 impairment, so that's what I responded to, not

11:11:43

11 necessarily --

12 Q. Understood.

13 A. -- disability.

14 Q. Earlier, you testified you became

15 aware of his medical diagnosis of acquired brain

11:11:48

16 injury sometime around June of 2018, right --

17 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

18 The witness may answer.

19 BY MR. SUAREZ:

20 Q. -- per the earlier discussion?

11:11:56

21 A. I believe it was later than that,

22 but . . .

1 The witness may answer. 11:19:11

2 THE WITNESS: Correct. I'm not

3 aware of any of those.

4 BY MR. SUAREZ:

5 Q. Why was all of this information 11:19:28

6 pertinent to whether Mr. Lenzi should have gotten

7 the Frankfurt position?

8 A. It's all factors, particularly

9 the -- the -- the issue dealing with the FBI,

10 which was Frankfurt-specific. I think we had 11:19:53

11 concerns about Mr. Lenzi going overseas at that

12 time in general because of the -- of the chain of

13 command insubordination and disrespect issues, as

14 well as the -- the -- the violation of the policy

15 on media engagement. 11:20:13

16 Q. Got it.

17 And you understand that the alleged

18 violations of the -- the media policy were in

19 relation to statements and advocacy Mr. Lenzi was

20 making with regard to the Havana Syndrome and his 11:20:28

21 disability, right?

22 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

Page 136

1 officer positions.

11:21:38

2 Do you see that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. You say "subsequently."

5 How many months later was that?

11:21:50

6 A. I -- I don't remember.

7 Q. So you're not sure.

8 So it could have been six months

9 later that that subsequently happened, right?

10 A. I don't think it was that long.

11:21:57

11 Q. Okay. It was months later, though,

12 right?

13 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

14 The witness may answer.

15 THE WITNESS: It was a while.

11:22:02

16 BY MR. SUAREZ:

17 Q. Okay.

18 Okay. And then, in Paragraph 28,

19 you say that [as read] Around March 3, 2020, the

20 positions were made unavailable for at-grade

11:22:59

21 bidders.

22 Right?

1           A.       I didn't say that; Mr. Lenzi stated   11:23:03  
2       that.

3           Q.       Okay. But you say that that seems  
4       about right, right?

5           A.       It seems about right, yes.           11:23:10

6           Q.       Okay. And -- and you don't dispute  
7       that sometime in early 2020, you were the one who  
8       approved the decision to make the two Frankfurt  
9       positions unavailable for at-grade bidders,  
10       right?   11:23:27

11          A.       I -- yeah, I approved the decision;  
12       I did not make the decision.

13          Q.       Who made the decision?

14          A.       I believe GTM and Mr. Stuart  
15       probably made that decision, probably the -- the   11:23:42  
16       DS -- the ST assignments recommendation panel.

17          Q.       Okay. And -- and you understood  
18       that once you approved that decision, that meant  
19       Mr. Lenzi would no longer be able to get the  
20       Frankfurt position, right?                   11:24:03

21          A.       Yeah.

22          Q.       Okay. And you also understand that

1                   So was it Nathan Lingenfelter who           11:29:43  
2       was the one who requested the entry-level  
3       positions, then?

4           A.       Apparently.

5           Q.       Okay. You're not sure, though?           11:29:52

6           A.       That's -- as it states here,  
7       according to Ron, Nathan Lingenfelter -- all I  
8       can say is what -- what is stated in here.

9           Q.       Now, who -- who -- who works with  
10       the CDO to -- to suggest, you know, what           11:30:03  
11       positions might be ceded to entry level?

12          A.       HR or GTM, the entry-level --  
13       entry- -- there's a entry-level office or  
14       entry-level director.

15          Q.       Got it.                                   11:30:24

16                   And then in the second paragraph,  
17       you write, Tamika Abbott is the operations  
18       division chief that has responsibility for  
19       managing and staffing the overseas offices. And  
20       it appears from this that her -- that was her           11:30:32  
21       strong preference, to fully staff Frankfurt with  
22       the appropriate entry-level staff.

Page 160

1 didn't want to get into a disagreement with 11:47:10

2 Mr. Lenzi; is that fair?

3 A. I don't recall. I don't recall

4 exactly --

5 Q. Okay. 11:47:18

6 A. -- what was in there, why.

7 Q. Okay. So there's some

8 back-and-forth, and we get to December 6th, 2019.

9 You e-mail Martha Lovejoy, Joy Baca, Ron Stuart

10 and Bart Brown. 11:47:34

11 Do you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Who's Bart Brown?

14 A. Bart Brown was -- I believe he was

15 the division chief or office director for PII, 11:47:54

16 which was protective intelligence investigations,

17 dealing with threats against employees.

18 Q. Got it.

19 So you write here, Bart, welcome to

20 the vortex. 11:48:30

21 What's the "vortex" you're referring

22 to?



1           A.       Just all of stuff associated with       11:48:34  
2       Mr. Lenzi.

3           Q.       Got it.

4                    So Mr. Lenzi -- dealing with  
5       Mr. Lenzi is like dealing with a vortex, right?       11:48:42

6           A.       In some manner.

7           Q.       Okay. And -- and you'll say, You'll  
8       note some Twitter posts below that an employee  
9       maybe was threatening.

10                   You -- you don't want to acknowledge       11:48:55  
11       here that they actually might be threatening;  
12       you're talking to him about Mr. Lenzi's view that  
13       they're threatening, right?

14                   MR. MEZGER: Objection to the form.

15                   The witness may answer.                   11:49:01

16                   THE WITNESS: I wouldn't want to  
17       characterize one way or the other. I  
18       would let that -- everything speak for  
19       itself.

20       BY MR. SUAREZ:                                       11:49:07

21           Q.       Got it.

22                   Let me ask you about your state of

Page 177

1 DS Combined Recommendations Panel from Friday, 12:04:35

2 November 15, 2019, correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. And this is the panel -- a

5 panel you sat on, correct? 12:04:47

6 A. It appears so, yes.

7 Q. All right. And you recall that this

8 is the particular panel that considered Mr. Lenzi

9 for the Frankfurt position?

10 A. Perhaps. 12:05:02

11 Q. Okay.

12 All right. Well, let's look for

13 him.

14 A. Here it is, Page 17647.

15 Q. Thank you. 12:06:48

16 All right. So it says,

17 SEO Frankfurt, FP-03, 57406000.

18 Correct?

19 A. Yep.

20 Q. And it says, ETA 8/2020. 12:07:04

21 Correct?

22 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. So that would be August 2020, 12:07:10  
2 correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. And that's in the summer 2020  
5 bidding cycle, correct? 12:07:17

6 A. It appears so, yes.

7 Q. And just to tie it in a bow, if you  
8 look at 17637, there's a heading that says,  
9 Summer 2020 (Overseas).

10 Correct? 12:07:41

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And -- and Mr. Lenzi's row in this  
13 giant sheet is under that subheading, correct?

14 A. Yes, it appears that way.

15 Q. Okay. And -- and to be clear, this 12:08:01  
16 was the action item for Mr. Lenzi that you  
17 deferred, correct?

18 A. I believe so.

19 Q. Okay. And I'm just going to ask it  
20 again for the record. Hopefully, we'll figure it 12:08:13  
21 out at some point. But do you know what that IND  
22 next to his name refers to?

Page 200

1 moved up to -- to Portsmouth.

01:20:33

2 Now, he's -- since he was assigned

3 to -- typically, to Washington, D.C., if he was

4 a -- if he had to go into a domestic

5 Washington, D.C. position, he would have to move 01:20:45

6 his vehicle and his household effects at his own

7 expense.

8 And I didn't feel that was right. I

9 felt -- I felt that the Department should --

10 should pay to -- to move that for him. 01:20:57

11 Q. Got it.

12 So -- but what do you mean when you

13 say you want to preclude an outburst?

14 A. Probably to pre- -- preclude a --

15 another -- another e-mail broadcast about he's 01:21:13

16 not being treated fairly.

17 Q. Okay. And then you say, Either way,

18 he'll eventually need to come back.

19 What -- what do you mean by coming

20 back? 01:21:30

21 A. Most likely, he would be assigned to

22 Washington, D.C., because the -- at that point,

1                   The witness may answer the                   01:29:19  
2                   question.

3                   THE WITNESS:   Correct.

4           BY MR. SUAREZ:

5           Q.       And -- and the ostensible reason why   01:29:21  
6           Mr. Lenzi has not been given ClassNet  
7           access since he was medevacked from Guangzhou is  
8           because he has had jobs that do not require  
9           ClassNet access, correct?

10                  MR. MEZGER:   Objection.                   01:29:33

11                  THE WITNESS:   Correct.

12                  Oh, sorry.

13                  Correct.

14           BY MR. SUAREZ:

15           Q.       And what percentage of overseas       01:29:36  
16           positions for SEOs require ClassNet access?

17           A.       I would say almost all of them.

18           Q.       Okay.   So nearly 100 percent?

19           A.       Nearly.

20           Q.       Okay.   Now, you have access to       01:29:47  
21           ClassNet, correct?

22           A.       I do not.

1 3:59 p.m. --

02:09:57

2 A. Right.

3 Q. -- correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. The Subject of the e-mail is 02:10:00

6 E-mails, correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. And -- and you write, Going

9 through my box looking for other stuff and

10 thought I better start sharing the wealth. 02:10:22

11 Correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. And the wealth that you're

14 sharing appears to be several attachments to the

15 e-mail, correct? 02:10:38

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And -- and -- and the several

18 attachments to the e-mail that you provide to

19 Mr. Giardino -- what you call "the wealth" are

20 e-mails that relate to Mr. Lenzi's advocacy and, 02:10:54

21 in your view, unprofessional e-mail; is that

22 fair?

1 MR. MEZGER: Objection to the form. 02:11:09

2 The witness may answer.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 BY MR. SUAREZ:

5 Q. Okay. And -- and so it would be 02:11:11

6 fair to say that -- you're welcome to count it,

7 but it would be fair to say that there's

8 something like 20 or 30 e-mails attached to this;

9 is that fair?

10 MR. MEZGER: Objection to form. 02:11:30

11 The witness may answer.

12 THE WITNESS: It appears that way.

13 BY MR. SUAREZ:

14 Q. Okay. And so you -- you wanted to

15 compile the greatest hits of Mr. Lenzi's 02:11:36

16 allegedly bad e-mails so that Mr. Giardino had

17 this information, correct?

18 A. Yeah. And at this point, I wasn't

19 exactly sure when Mr. Gino had -- Giardino had

20 retired and came -- he came to work for us for -- 02:11:56

21 for -- in -- in countermeasures program. It

22 might have been that this was after that.

Page 289

1 MR. MEZGER: Same objection. 02:59:47

2 The witness may answer.

3 THE WITNESS: Of a security

4 clearance.

5 BY MR. SUAREZ: 02:59:50

6 Q. Okay. How many situations over your

7 30-year career are you familiar with where

8 someone removed a State Department employee's

9 access to OpenNet?

10 A. Several. 03:00:02

11 Q. Okay. How many?

12 A. Half a dozen, maybe.

13 Q. Okay. So about six over the course

14 of your 30-year career; is that fair?

15 A. Yeah, keeping in mind that for the 03:00:14

16 first 12 years of my career, there wasn't

17 OpenNet.

18 Q. Explain that.

19 A. We didn't have -- we didn't have

20 OpenNet until about 2000. 03:00:23

21 Q. Okay. But was -- was -- there --

22 was it -- was it that everything was in a



Page 356

1       there was -- there's controversy. 04:25:32

2                   And I -- I don't -- I don't know  
3       that Mark was incorrect in this and just -- just  
4       forwarding it to -- to Todd for his -- his  
5       awareness. 04:25:45

6           Q.       Okay. Why did you add the color  
7       commentary about it being more drama?

8                   MR. MEZGER: Objection to form.

9                   The witness may answer.

10                  THE WITNESS: I think it speaks for 04:25:55  
11       itself.

12       BY MR. SUAREZ:

13           Q.       You -- you -- you think Lenzi's --  
14       Mark -- Mr. Lenzi's -- the issues he's raising  
15       are a bunch of drama? 04:26:02

16           A.       It's drama -- he's not necessarily  
17       wrong, but it's drama.

18           Q.       Okay. So -- so on this issue,  
19       you -- you don't think Mr. Lenzi's wrong?

20           A.       I think -- I think he had an 04:26:14  
21       expectation that -- that -- that whatever therapy  
22       he was going through was going to be counted

Page 357

1 as -- as work time.

04:26:27

2 Appropriate or not, I -- you know,

3 that's -- that's a question for others, but I

4 don't know that it was completely unreasonable

5 for him to think that.

04:26:38

6 As I recall, Mr. Lenzi had to file

7 with Department of Labor for -- for disability --

8 something. And I don't know that at this point,

9 he had done that. And until he had done that, I

10 think -- I don't think that was -- it was -- the 04:26:59

11 Department was willing to count that as -- as

12 work time.

13 But I believe it got all

14 straightened out in Mr. Lenzi's favor.

15 Q. Are you talking about he was able to 04:27:15

16 get administrative leave for his -- his times

17 going to therapies?

18 A. As I recall, yes.

19 Q. Okay.

20 MR. SUAREZ: Exhibit 34.

04:27:45

21

22

Page 389

1 -- the assignment up in -- in Portsmouth. 05:03:40

2 Q. Do you think it would have been  
3 reasonable to give Mr. Lenzi a Y tour, from your  
4 perspective, at least?

5 A. From my perspective, yes -- 05:03:52

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. -- from HR's perspective, apparently  
8 they disagreed.

9 Q. Okay.

10 MR. SUAREZ: Okay. I'm going to 05:05:19

11 hand you 39.

12 --oOo--

13 (Fitzsimmons Deposition Exhibit

14 Number 39, E-mail string, Bates

15 stamped STATE00020624 through 05:00:34

16 STATE00020625, marked for

17 identification, as of this date.)

18 --oOo--

19 MR. SUAREZ: Thirty-nine is 20624

20 and 20625. 05:05:58

21 BY MR. SUAREZ:

22 Q. The Subject of this is PCS Dates,

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Cindy L. Sebo, Nationally Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public herein do hereby certify that the foregoing deposition of **JOHN EDMUND FITZSIMMONS** was taken before me pursuant to notice, at the time and place indicated; that said deponent was by me duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth under penalty of perjury; that the testimony of said deponent was correctly recorded to the best of my ability in machine shorthand and thereafter transcribed under my supervision with computer-aided transcription; that the deposition is a true and accurate record of the testimony given by the witness; and that I am neither of counsel nor kin to any party in said action, nor interested in the outcome thereof.



Cindy L. Sebo, RMR, CRR, RPR, CSR,  
CCR, CLR, RSA, NYRCR, NYACR, Remote  
CA CSR #14409, Remote Counsel Reporter,  
LiveLitigation Authorized Reporter,  
Notary Public

**PX-002**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

MARK LENZI,

Plaintiff,

V.

No. 1:21-cv-1371 (PTG/IDD)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE and  
ANTHONY J. BLINKEN, U.S. Secretary of State,  
Defendants.

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S  
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANTS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 26(C) and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, Defendants, through undersigned counsel, state the following objections and provide the following responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories. By providing the information contained in the following responses, Defendants do not waive any objection as to the information's admissibility on the grounds of relevance, materiality, or other appropriate grounds. Responses have been generated as set forth in Defendants' objections and responses below and following a reasonable, good-faith search for information.

## DEFINITIONS

1. To the extent Definition 1 and 2, as used throughout Plaintiff's discovery requests, purport to impose an obligation to produce information from the U.S. Secretary of State and/or the U.S. Department of State in its entirety and across its tens of thousands of employees, Defendants object to this definition on the grounds that it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims in this action and is not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants will conduct a reasonable search for responsive, unprivileged, unclassified information from a

reasonable number of State Department employees with specific knowledge about the complained of employment actions in this case.

2. Defendants object to Definitions 3 and 4 insofar as they purport to request any material that has been classified pursuant to Executive Order 13526 and thus may be protected by the state secrets privilege, or that resides on classified systems, to which private counsel in a civil action are not entitled and may not receive. *E.g., El-Masri v. United States*, 479 F.3d 296, 311 (4th Cir. 2007). Defendants similarly object to the extent these definitions purport to request any material (including, but not limited to, the request for “drafts,” as well as materials from “counsel”) that is otherwise privileged or protected from disclosure, including but not limited to the attorney client privilege, the deliberative process privilege, the attorney work product protection, and the law enforcement privilege. Defendants object to the scope of “in the possession, custody, or control of you, of any officer, agent, employee, representative, counsel, or other person” in Definition 3, and to the scope of “any” in Definition 4, as there are tens of thousands of State Department employees, and the definitions as written do not consider the relevance of those employees or the proportionality of such a request. Defendants will define “document” and “communication” consistent with the meaning of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34 and will conduct a reasonable search for responsive, unprivileged, unclassified information from a reasonable number of State Department employees with specific knowledge about the complained of employment actions in this case.

3. Defendants object to Definitions 8 and 19 as overbroad and disproportionate to the needs of the case and, as read together, vague and ambiguous because the same terms are defined with different meanings. Defendants will use the ordinary dictionary meanings of “relating” and “concerning.” Merriam-Webster defines “relating” as “to show or establish local

or causal connection between,” and defines “concerning” as “relating to: regarding.”

4. Defendants object to Definition 11 to the extent it requests information beyond the possession, custody, or control of the State Department. Defendants further object to the extent it requests information that has been classified pursuant to Executive Order 13526 and thus may be protected by the state secrets privilege, or that is located on classified systems, to which private counsel in a civil action are not entitled and may not receive. *E.g., El-Masri v. United States*, 479 F.3d 296, 311 (4th Cir. 2007). Defendants also object to the extent it requests information that is protected from disclosure by the attorney client privilege, the attorney work product protection, the deliberative process privilege, the law enforcement privilege, or any other applicable privilege.

5. Defendants object to “any subsequent amendments to” in Definitions 12 and 13, as there is only one operative complaint and one operative answer and the parties have represented to the Court that they do not anticipate filing amended pleadings.

6. Defendants object to Definition 15 to the extent it imposes any obligations beyond those in the Federal and Local Rules, including in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), as well as to the extent it imposes any obligations beyond those in the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan (Dkt. No. 35). Defendants further object under the Privacy Act to providing an individual’s home address.

7. Defendants object to the inclusion of “any firm, corporation, proprietorship, joint venture, trust or estate, business, association, partnership, or other form of legal entity, unless the context indicates otherwise” in Definition 17 as vague and overbroad, without regard to the relevance to the issues in this action or the proportionality of such a request. Defendants will define “person” as natural persons employed by the State Department with specific knowledge about the complained of employment actions in this case.



8. With respect to Definition 18, Defendants incorporate by reference their objections to Definitions 1 through 4, stated above.

### **INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Defendants object to Instruction 1 to the extent any interrogatory seeks information that is duplicative, in whole or in part, of that sought in another interrogatory. Defendants further object to the extent the instruction calls upon Defendants to respond to an excess of 30 interrogatories, inclusive of their subparts, in violation of the parties' Joint Discovery Plan (Dkt. No. 35).

2. With respect to Instruction 2, Defendants incorporate by reference their objections to Definitions 1 through 4. Defendants further object to the extent this instruction imposes obligations beyond those in the Federal and Local Rules. In responding to these interrogatories, Defendants will conduct a reasonable search for responsive, unprivileged, unclassified information from a reasonable number of State Department employees with specific knowledge about the complained of employment actions in this case.

3. Defendants object to Instruction 3 to the extent it imposes obligations beyond those in the Federal and Local Rules.

4. Defendants object to Instructions 4 and 5 to the extent and on the grounds that it imposes obligations beyond those in the parties' Joint Discovery Plan (Dkt. No. 35).

5. Defendants object to Instruction 6 on the grounds that it imposes obligations beyond those in Federal Rule 33(d).

6. Defendants object to Instruction 7 to the extent it imposes obligations beyond those in the Federal Rules. Defendants will provide appropriate supplements to their responses "in a timely manner" pursuant to Federal Rule 26(e).

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORIES**

**INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Identify the persons and their titles involved in any Assignment Panel and/or a Suitability Review Panel, as well as the dates of those panels, concerning Mr. Lenzi and his bid for Guangzhou, China, as well as other bids by Mr. Lenzi for overseas postings including (1) SEO position numbers 57408002 and 57408004 in Frankfurt, Germany; (2) SEO position number 57408003 in Belgrade, Serbia; (3) SEO position number 56803003 in Athens, Greece; (4) SEO position number 56001010 in Warsaw, Poland; (5) Political/Economic Officer position number 14035112 in Krakow, Poland; and (6) SEO position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan, as described in the First Amended Complaint.

**OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** In addition to the above objections to Definitions and Instructions, Defendants object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it improperly presents seven (7) interrogatories on seven different topics; accordingly, Defendants will count this interrogatory as seven separate interrogatories. Defendants also object to the request for information regarding “Mr. Lenzi and his bid for Guangzhou, China” and “SEO position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan,” as neither of those positions are alleged in the Complaint to be among the challenged assignment decisions in this action, *see* Dkt. No. 27 ¶¶ 60–89, and are therefore neither relevant to the claims in this action nor proportionate to the needs of the case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Defendants likewise object to the request for information regarding any “Suitability Review Panel” as seeking information that is not relevant and proportional to this action, as Suitability Review Panels are not a part of the assignments process for members of the Foreign Service. Defendants object to the phrase “involved in” as vague and ambiguous and, depending on how tangentially Plaintiff defines the phrase, objects to the request for information that is not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants additionally assert a Privacy Act objection to the disclosure of information regarding “persons” not named as a party to this action.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, and pursuant to the parties’ meet and confer discussions to date, Defendants respond to the five separate components of this interrogatory regarding the individuals who sat on the Assignment Panels (if any) concerning Mr. Lenzi’s bid for each of the following positions, as well as the approximate date of the panels: (1) Frankfurt, (2) Athens, (3) Belgrade, (4) Warsaw, and (5) Krakow positions. Pursuant to their objections, Defendants are not responding to the sixth and seventh components of this interrogatory regarding Guangzhou or Baku or, more generally, to any unidentified “other bids by Mr. Lenzi for overseas postings.”

**Interrogatory No. 1.1 (Frankfurt):**

- ST Advisory Panel (met on October 22, 2019):
  - Tamika Abbott (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Technology Operations Division);
  - Mark Graves (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Systems Integration Division);
  - Joy Herrera-Baca (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Facility Security Engineering Division);
  - Gharun Lacy (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Countermeasures Program Division);
  - Jim Nicodemus (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Facility Security Engineering Division);
  - Matt Percival (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Victor Ratermanis (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Chimere Ravenel Waterstreet (Branch Chief – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Overseas Support Branch);
  - Ronald Stuart (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology);
  - Monique Theriot (Senior Security Engineering Officer – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Technology Operations Division, Overseas Support Branch);
  - Rahim Theriot (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Services, Training Directorate, Office of the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, Technical Security Engineering Division).

- DS Advisory Panel (met on November 15, 2019)
  - Todd Brown (Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Diplomatic Security Service Directorate);
  - Assiya Ashraf-Miller (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, International Programs Directorate);
  - Ricardo Colon (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Domestic Operations Directorate);
  - John Fitzsimmons (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate);
  - Carlos Matus (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Threat Investigations and Analysis Directorate);
  - Lonnie Price (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate);
  - Greg Sherman (Deputy Assistant Secretary – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, High Threat Programs Directorate);
  - Karl Bultrowicz (Senior Diplomatic Security Representative for GTM/CDA and Senior Assignments Officer for Diplomatic Security Positions);
  - Stephen Dietz (Executive Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security);
  - Doug Quiram (Senior Coordinator – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Senior Coordinator for Security Infrastructure, Office of Personnel Security and Suitability);
  - Erin Smart (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Senior Coordinator for Security Infrastructure, Office of Personnel Security and Suitability)

**Interrogatory No. 1.2 (Athens):**

- ST Advisory Panel (met on October 23, 2020):
  - Tamika Abbott (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Technology Operations Division);
  - Mark Graves (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Systems Integration Division);

- Gharun Lacy (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Countermeasures Program Division);
- James Nicodemus (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Facility Security Engineering Division);
- Matthew Percival (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
- Victor Ratermanis (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
- Chimere Ravenel Waterstreet (Branch Chief – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Overseas Support Branch);
- Ronald Stuart (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology);
- Rahim Theriot (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Services, Training Directorate, Office of the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, Technical Security Engineering Division)

**Interrogatory No. 1.3 (Belgrade):**

- ST Advisory Panel (met on October 23, 2020):
  - Tamika Abbott (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Technology Operations Division);
  - Mark Graves (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Systems Integration Division);
  - Gharun Lacy (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Countermeasures Program Division);
  - James Nicodemus (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security,

Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Facility Security Engineering Division);

- Matthew Percival (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Victor Ratermanis (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Chimere Ravenel Waterstreet (Branch Chief – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Overseas Support Branch);
  - Ronald Stuart (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology);
  - Rahim Theriot (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Services, Training Directorate, Office of the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, Technical Security Engineering Division)
- GTM/CDA Assignment Panel (met on November 19, 2020, to consider Plaintiff's assignment challenge on the Belgrade position)
    - Elliot Harris (Human Resources Specialist – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments);
    - Chris Teal (Director – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
    - Cristina Stokes (Deputy Director, Specialist Unit – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Entry-Level Division);
    - Myrna Kerr-Ortiz (Career Development Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
    - Terry Boyle (Career Development Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
    - Charles Cole (Director of Political Sub-Unit – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);

- Andrea Cameron (Career Development Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
- John Schuch (Human Resources Specialist – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments);
- Patrick Gorman (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Ann Evans (Human Resources Specialist – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Sarah Alonso (Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Baber Sultan (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Stacey Steger (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Jonathan Mennuti (Office Director – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments);
- Tim Roche (Division Chief – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Michael Cragun (Deputy Director – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments)

**Interrogatory No. 1.4 (Warsaw):**

- ST Advisory Panel (met on October 23, 2020):
  - Tamika Abbott (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Technology Operations Division);
  - Mark Graves (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Security Systems Integration Division);

- Gharun Lacy (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Countermeasures Program Division);
  - James Nicodemus (Division Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Facility Security Engineering Division);
  - Matthew Percival (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Victor Ratermanis (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Cyber and Technology Security Directorate, Office of Technology Innovation and Engineering);
  - Chimere Ravenel Waterstreet (Branch Chief – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology, Overseas Support Branch);
  - Ronald Stuart (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Countermeasures Directorate, Office of Security Technology);
  - Rahim Theriot (Office Director – Bureau of Diplomatic Services, Training Directorate, Office of the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, Technical Security Engineering Division)
- GTM/CDA Assignment Panel (met on February 11, 2021 to consider Plaintiff's assignment challenge on the Warsaw position)
    - Elliot Harris (Human Resources Specialist – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments);
    - Kim Murphy (Deputy Director – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
    - Sumera Ashruf (Director – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Entry-Level Division);
    - Zahid Raja (Career Development Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
    - Etienne Singleton (Deputy Director for Diplomatic Security Unit – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);



- Jonathan Nellis (Counseling and Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
- Connie Oestreich (Career Development Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Mid-Level Division);
- John Schuch (Human Resources Specialist – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments);
- Sophie Gao (Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Traci Goins (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Sarah Alonso (Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Baber Sultan (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division);
- Lindsey Herrity (Deputy Assignments Officer – Bureau of Global Talent Management, Office of Career Development and Assignments, Assignment Division).

**Interrogatory No. 1.5 (Krakow):** As Plaintiff was neither selected for, nor placed on a short-list for the Krakow vacancy, no assignment panel considered any decision concerning Plaintiff's bid in connection with the Krakow assignment.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

Identify all individuals stationed overseas with any affiliations with the State Department or any embassy or consulate who had any communications relating to Mr. Lenzi's efforts to pursue overseas postings in each of: (1) SEO position numbers 57408002 and 57408004 in Frankfurt, Germany; (2) SEO position number 57408003 in Belgrade, Serbia; (3) SEO position number 56803003 in Athens, Greece; (4) SEO position number 56001010 in Warsaw, Poland; (5) Political/Economic Officer position number 14035112 in Krakow, Poland; and (6) Officer in Charge position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan, as described in the First Amended Complaint.

**OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** In addition to the above objections to

Definitions and Instructions, Defendants object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it improperly presents six (6) interrogatories on six different topics; accordingly, Defendants will count this interrogatory as six separate interrogatories. Defendants also object to the request for information regarding “Officer in Charge position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan,” as that position is not alleged in the Complaint to be among the challenged assignment decisions in this action, *see* Dkt. No. 27 ¶¶ 60–89, and is therefore neither relevant to the claims in this action nor proportionate to the needs of the case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Defendants object to the request for “all individuals” “with any affiliations” “who had any communications” as overbroad and disproportionate to the needs of the case, both because those individuals do not make the assignment decisions, and because Plaintiff is already in possession of the information regarding the individuals overseas with whom he spoke about each position at issue—especially since Plaintiff is the only individual who could know what “efforts” he took. Further, as written, this interrogatory would purport to require Defendants to interview “all individuals stationed overseas with any affiliations with the State Department or any embassy or consulate” in order to determine whether such individual “had any communications relating to Mr. Lenzi’s efforts to pursue overseas postings.” Such a request is not proportionate to the needs of the case and carries the additional burden of ensuring that Defendants would be in compliance with international law to the extent that any of the “affiliates” are foreign nationals. Defendants additionally assert a Privacy Act objection to the disclosure of information regarding “individuals” not named as a party to this action.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, and pursuant to the parties’ meet and confer discussions to date, Plaintiff will provide Defendants with the names of the embassy/consulate staff with whom he communicated, and Defendants will undertake a reasonable inquiry into additional embassy/consulate staff with whom those individuals had substantive communications about Plaintiff’s efforts to pursue an assignment with that embassy/consulate. Defendants will supplement their response to this interrogatory as appropriate.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

Identify all facts that were considered in the Agency’s decisions not to reassign Mr. Lenzi to the overseas posts to which he bid or applied, and all arguments supporting such decisions, including for (1) SEO position numbers 57408002 and 57408004 in Frankfurt, Germany; (2) SEO position number 57408003 in Belgrade, Serbia; (3) SEO position number 56803003 in Athens, Greece; (4) SEO position number 56001010 in Warsaw, Poland; and (5) Political/Economic Officer position number 14035112 in Krakow, Poland; or to place Mr. Lenzi in (6) SEO position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan, as described in the First Amended Complaint.

**OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** In addition to the above objections to Definitions and Instructions, Defendants object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it improperly presents six (6) interrogatories on six different topics; accordingly, Defendants will count this interrogatory as six separate interrogatories. Defendants also object to the request for information regarding “SEO position number 57255028 in Baku, Azerbaijan,” as that position is not alleged in the Complaint to be among the challenged assignment decisions in this action, *see* Dkt. No. 27 ¶¶ 60–89, and is therefore neither relevant to the claims in this action nor proportionate to the needs of the case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Similarly, Defendants object to the extent that “overseas posts to which he bid or applied” is written to include additional overseas posts beyond those in Frankfurt, Belgrade, Athens, Warsaw, and Krakow, as only those assignments have been challenged in this action. Defendants also object to the phrase “all facts that were considered ... and all arguments supporting such decisions” as vague and ambiguous and, as such, overbroad and unduly burdensome.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, and pursuant to the parties’ meet and confer discussions to date, Defendants respond to the five separate components of this interrogatory regarding the reasons that Plaintiff was not reassigned to the (1) Frankfurt, (2) Athens, (3) Belgrade, (4) Warsaw, and (5) Krakow positions. Pursuant to their objections, Defendants are not responding to the sixth component of this interrogatory regarding Baku or, more generally, to any unidentified “overseas posts to which [Plaintiff] bid or applied.”

**Background:** The process of identifying a candidate for a Security Engineering Officer (“SEO”) vacancy begins at the Bureau of Diplomatic Security’s (“DS”) Directorate level. Directorates are subdivisions of an Agency bureau. Senior SEOs from DS’s Countermeasures Directorate, Training Directorate, and Cyber and Technology Security Directorate meet as a Security Technology Advisory Panel (“ST Advisory Panel”), typically on a monthly basis, to review vacant SEO positions and individual bidder information, and to identify “preferred candidates” for recommendation to DS’s Deputy Assistant Secretaries (“DASes”). After the monthly ST Advisory Panel meeting, DS convenes the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel, during which DS’s DASes review the proposed assignment recommendations and approve, deny, or defer for later consideration the proposed recommendations. The DS Assignments

Recommendation Panel's approval of a candidate for a position identifies the employee as the bureau's "preferred candidate" and results in a "handshake offer," which is an informal agreement between a bureau and an employee for an assignment proposal, to the identified candidate. If the handshake offer is accepted by the candidate, the handshake is registered in the Department's bidding software. After the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel approves a proposed handshake, the Bureau of Global Talent Management's ("GTM") Office of Career Development and Assignments ("GTM/CDA") reviews the proposed assignment for compliance with Agency policy. If the proposed assignment is compliant, it will go to a GTM/CDA assignment panel for final approval. Only after the GTM/CDA assignment panel approves is an employee's assignment finalized.

An employee who is not selected for certain Foreign Service positions may initiate an "assignment challenge" (informally known as a "shootout"), which requires the GTM/CDA assignment panel to vote on whether to assign the position at issue to the selected employee or the challenging employee (or employees). Before voting, the panel will typically review the description of the challenged position, statements provided by each employee, and statements provided by the bureau. The panel will then discuss the challenge and vote on which employee to assign the position. An employee may appeal the panel's decision to the Director General of the Foreign Service through a process known as DG Direct within ten business days. The Director General's decision is final, and GTM/CDA must implement the Director General's decision.

Foreign Service assignments are typically made through a system in which Foreign Service employees bid on assignments in software called FSBid (and subsequently, TalentMAP) during what is known as "Open Assignments Season." There are generally two cycles for bidders: a summer cycle and a winter cycle. An employee is eligible to bid for assignments in a particular

cycle when the employee's transfer eligibility date (TED) (the expected end date of an assignment) corresponds with the TED range of that cycle. For example, for 2021 Foreign Service assignments, employees whose TED fell between May 1 and October 31, 2021 were considered Summer (2021) cycle bidders and were eligible to bid on jobs that had TEDs in that same timeframe. In contrast, "NOW" bidders are bidders who are not part of the summer or winter cycles for various reasons, including, but not limited to, having an immediately prior tour cut short. NOW bidders are expected to bid only on assignments designated as NOW assignments—which typically are available to start immediately—not summer or winter cycle assignments (which typically start several months later).

New Foreign Service specialist career candidates, including SEOs, are hired on four-year appointments. With limited exceptions, specialist candidates must receive tenure within those four years to remain in the Foreign Service. Pursuant to GTM's Standard Operating Procedure ("SOP") on specialist assignments, first and second-tour specialists are generally assigned to overseas positions to the extent such positions are available. Providing "entry-level" specialist candidates (Foreign Service specialists who have not yet completed two assignments or tours and have not yet received tenure) an opportunity to work overseas is vital to the Agency's tenure review process. However, given the unpredictable nature of recruitment and hiring authority for smaller Foreign Service skill codes, including SEOs, DS does not reserve overseas positions for the assignment of entry-level SEOs. Thus, in preparation of virtually every Foreign Service assignment cycle, Career Development Officers ("CDOs") who are responsible for DS's SEOs review all projected overseas SEO vacancies to determine which of those vacancies may be "ceded" to entry-level SEOs.

**Interrogatory No. 3.1 (Frankfurt):** Plaintiff was not assigned to one of the two FP-03 SEO positions in Frankfurt because the positions were ceded to GTM/CDA's Entry Level Division

for use by entry-level SEOs before any mid-level bidder was assigned. On October 22, 2019, the ST Advisory Panel met to review bidder information and recommend the first tranche of handshake offers for the bidding cycle in effect at the time. During the meeting, the Panel decided to recommend Plaintiff to the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel for one of the vacant Frankfurt positions. On November 15, 2019, the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel met to consider initial handshake offers for the Summer 2020 cycle, including the ST Advisory Panel's recommendation that Plaintiff be selected for a vacant SEO position in Frankfurt. During the meeting, the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel deferred consideration of Plaintiff for the Frankfurt position at the suggestion of John Fitzsimmons, who was then DAS of DS's Countermeasures Directorate.

Fitzsimmons recommended that the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel defer considering Plaintiff's bid for the Frankfurt position to a subsequent panel meeting for several reasons. First, Plaintiff had previously and recently served a tour in Frankfurt. Foreign Service employees, including Foreign Service Specialists such as Plaintiff, are generally expected to serve at different posts and in different regions to expand their expertise and responsibilities. Second, the position in Frankfurt was at the Frankfurt Engineering Services Center ("ESC"). Plaintiff had previously served in essentially the same position. Foreign Service employees, including Foreign Service Specialists such as Plaintiff, are expected to take on new responsibilities and master new skills as they progress throughout their career. The Frankfurt SEO positions were ideal entry-level positions because they provided new specialists with substantial opportunities for supervision and mentoring. As Plaintiff was a mid-level SEO, a typical career progression would expect him to be running a small office (generally an Engineering Services Office or "ESO"). Third, prior to the November 15, 2019 DS Assignments Recommendation Panel meeting, Ambassador Robert

Yamate, at the time the Care Coordinator for the Health Incidents Response Task Force, had informed Fitzsimmons that Plaintiff had told Ambassador Yamate that the FBI had recommended that Plaintiff be assigned to Frankfurt because that location could best ensure his personal security and that the FBI would potentially get involved in the assignment if need be. Fitzsimmons sought the deferment at panel, in part, in order to verify this highly unorthodox situation by confirming this information with DS's contacts at the FBI. Fitzsimmons did not explain his reasoning for proposing deferral during the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel meeting, and neither Fitzsimmons nor the other panel members recall any objection to or discussion about the proposal. As Fitzsimmons was the DAS who oversaw the DS division responsible for security technology, it was typical and unremarkable that other panel members would defer to his recommendation. After being informed of the FBI issue, Fitzsimmons reached out to David Whitehead, Senior Advisor in the DS Countermeasures Programs Division, to inquire with that Division's FBI liaison about Plaintiff's claims. Following further discussions with Whitehead, Fitzsimmons understood that the FBI had no information regarding Plaintiff's claim that the FBI would protect him, had not offered to intervene in the Foreign Service assignment process on behalf of Plaintiff, and had no opinion or interest in Plaintiff being assigned to Frankfurt or any other location. Deferring the consideration of Plaintiff for the Frankfurt position did not constitute a decision on the position; it simply meant the panel would make a decision at a subsequent meeting.

The Frankfurt vacancies were not reviewed again by the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel before they were ceded to entry-level SEOs. In or around March 2020, GTM/CDA learned that new SEOs would be joining the April 2020 Foreign Service Specialist orientation class, creating a need to identify positions suitable for entry-level assignments. Plaintiff's CDO Nathan Lingenfelter, who covered SEO assignments, and the ST Advisory Panel

determined that, of the fourteen SEO vacancies that remained at the time, the two Frankfurt vacancies were most suitable for new SEOs. SEO vacancies that are appropriate to cede to entry-level SEOs are overseas vacancies at an Engineering Services Office or ESC where an incoming SEO reports to a more experienced and higher-ranked SEO within the same office or ESC. The Frankfurt vacancies met this criterion. Additionally, they were the only two overseas positions at the FP-03 level, and as entry-level officers are FP-04 and below, only FP-03 and lower positions are appropriate for ceding to entry-level specialist candidates, and they involved “traditional” SEO work, including designing, installing, and maintaining security equipment and conducting countermeasures inspections. GTM/CDA’s Entry-Level Division (GTM/CDA/EL) subsequently approved the two Frankfurt positions for ceding to new SEOs in the April 2020 orientation specialist class.

**Interrogatory No. 3.2 (Athens):** Plaintiff was not assigned to the FP-04 SEO position in Athens (a position below Plaintiff’s grade) because the position was ceded to GTM/CDA’s Entry Level Division for use by entry-level SEOs before any mid-level bidder was assigned.

On October 23, 2020, the ST Advisory Panel met to determine which recommendations for SEO positions it would present to the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel. Towards the beginning of the meeting, the ST Advisory Panel asked Plaintiff’s CDO Andrew Kaleczyc which bid cycle Plaintiff was in, and Kaleczyc advised that Plaintiff was a NOW bidder—as confirmed by GTM/CDA leadership—who wished to be considered for Summer 2021 positions. Tamika Abbott, then the Division Director of DS’s Security Operations Division, noted that DS had NOW positions available that would be both career-appropriate and career-enhancing for Plaintiff, including an FP-03 vacancy in Monterrey, Mexico for which he would be a good candidate. There was no further discussion of Plaintiff’s candidacy for any Summer 2021 position.



On January 4, 2021, Andrew Kaleczyc—who at the time was the CDO for DS’s SEOs—reviewed all projected overseas SEO vacancies for the Summer 2021 bidding cycle to determine which of those vacancies could be ceded to entry-level SEOs. Kaleczyc determined that only three projected overseas SEO vacancies in the Summer 2021 bidding cycle met these criteria and cycle timing requirements: an FP-04 position in Athens, Greece; an FP-03 position in Dubai, United Arab Emirates; and an FP-04 position in Moscow, Russia. At the time Kaleczyc reviewed the positions, the Department was experiencing severe delays in securing visas to Russia for Foreign Service employees, which had disrupted the timing of new Foreign Service assignments to that country. As a result, the Moscow vacancy was eliminated from consideration as a viable position for an entry-level SEO. As at least two entry-level SEOs would require overseas assignments in the Summer 2021 assignment cycle, Kaleczyc determined the Athens vacancy and the Dubai vacancy to be the most appropriate options for those SEOs.

Kaleczyc discussed the need to reserve the Athens and Dubai vacancies for entry-level SEOs with Tamika Abbott and other members of DS’s Office of Security Technology leadership. Subsequently, Sumera Ashruf (Director of GTM/CDA/EL) and Christina Stokes (Deputy Director of the Specialist Unit in GTM/CDA/EL) approved these positions to be used for two entry-level SEOs who were finishing tours in Washington, D.C. and needed overseas assignments. The Athens and Dubai positions were subsequently removed from the Summer 2021 bidding cycle. The DS Assignments Recommendation Panel played no role in the selection or non-selection of SEOs for the Athens position because the ST Advisory Panel did not identify a recommended candidate for this position for the DS Assignment Recommendation Panel’s consideration.

**Interrogatory No. 3.3 (Belgrade):** Plaintiff was not eligible for assignment to the FP-03 SEO position in Belgrade because he was a NOW bidder attempting to bid for a Summer 2021

position. The candidate who was recommended by the ST Advisory Panel, who was identified as the bureau-preferred candidate by the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel, and whose assignment was formally approved by GTM/CDA was an eligible and competitive bidder who was bidding for a position within the appropriate assignment cycle (*i.e.*, Summer 2021).

On October 23, 2020, the ST Advisory Panel met to determine which recommendations for SEO positions it would present to the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel. Towards the beginning of the meeting, the ST Advisory Panel asked Plaintiff's CDO Andrew Kaleczyc which bid cycle Plaintiff was in, and Kaleczyc advised that Plaintiff was a NOW bidder—as confirmed by GTM/CDA leadership—who wished to be considered for Summer 2021 positions. Tamika Abbott noted that DS had NOW positions available that would be both career-appropriate and career-enhancing for Plaintiff, including an FP-03 vacancy in Monterrey, Mexico for which he would be a good candidate. There was no further discussion of Plaintiff's candidacy for any Summer 2021 position. The Panel ultimately decided to recommend a different candidate for the Belgrade position. The recommended candidate was chosen, in part, because he was an eligible and competitive Summer 2021 bidder, and Belgrade was a position in the Summer 2021 bid cycle.

On November 5, 2020, the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel met and accepted the ST Advisory Panel's proposal to extend a handshake offer for the FP-03 position to its preferred candidate. The panel did not assess Plaintiff's candidacy for the position because only the candidate recommended by the ST Advisory Panel was brought before it in accordance with the panel's customary practice. The handshake was subsequently registered in the Agency's online bid system.

On or about November 9, 2020, Plaintiff initiated an assignment challenge for the Belgrade position. On November 19, 2020, a GTM/CDA assignment panel reviewed the standard

documentation prepared for all assignments challenges, including the employee statements, the DS bureau statement, and employee assignment data. Finding no issues with the assignment recommendation, the GTM/CDA assignment panel unanimously approved the candidate who had been recommended by the ST Advisory Panel and approved by the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel for the FP-03 Belgrade position.

Plaintiff subsequently appealed the GTM/CDA assignment panel's decision to the Director General. In his statement to the Director General in support of his appeal, he stated among other things, that he was interviewed for a segment on *60 Minutes*, and that he had given an interview to the *New York Times* in which he alleged that the Agency had discriminated and/or retaliated against him due to a disability that he incurred while on an overseas Foreign Service assignment. An action memorandum, dated January 22, 2021, from GTM/CDA Acting Director Naomi Lyew to Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary ("PDAS") Kenneth Merten (who was temporarily undertaking the duties of the Director General while the Director General was performing the duties of the vacant position of Under Secretary of State for Management), which was initially drafted by Plaintiff's CDO, Kaleczyc, confirmed Plaintiff's statement that Plaintiff had made media appearances on various outlets. The memo also informed PDAS Merten that Plaintiff was contesting his non-selection for the SEO vacancy in Frankfurt, and that he had rejected Kaleczyc's advice to bid on an overseas NOW position in Monterrey because he would have been a strong candidate for that position. The memo recommended that PDAS Merten disapprove Plaintiff's request to overturn the results of the GTM assignment panel's decision on the Belgrade challenge, and that he approve of GTM informing Plaintiff that he must bid on NOW positions. On January 25, 2021, finding no compelling reason to overturn the GTM/CDA assignment panel shootout decision, PDAS Merten approved GTM/CDA's recommendations in full.

**Interrogatory No. 3.4 (Warsaw):** Plaintiff was not eligible for assignment to the FP-02 SEO position in Warsaw (a position above Plaintiff's grade) because he was a NOW bidder attempting to bid for a Summer 2021 position. The candidate who was recommended by the ST Advisory Panel, identified as the bureau-preferred candidate by the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel, and whose assignment was formally approved by GTM/CDA, was an eligible and competitive bidder who was bidding for a position within the appropriate assignment cycle (*i.e.*, Summer 2021).

On October 23, 2020, the ST Advisory Panel met to determine which recommendations for SEO positions it would present to the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel. Towards the beginning of the meeting, the ST Advisory Panel asked CDO Andrew Kaleczyc which bid cycle Plaintiff was in, and Kaleczyc advised—as confirmed by GTM/CDA leadership—that Plaintiff was a NOW bidder who wished to be considered for Summer 2021 positions. Tamika Abbott noted that DS had NOW positions that would be both career-appropriate and career-enhancing for Plaintiff, including a vacancy in Monterrey, Mexico for which he would be a good candidate. There was no further discussion of Plaintiff's candidacy for any Summer 2021 position. The Panel ultimately decided to recommend a different candidate for the Warsaw position. The recommended candidate was chosen, in part, because he was an eligible and competitive Summer 2021 bidder, and Warsaw was a position in the Summer 2021 bidding cycle.

On November 5, 2020, the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel met and accepted the ST Advisory Panel's proposal to extend a handshake offer for the FP-02 Warsaw position to its preferred candidate. The panel did not assess Plaintiff's candidacy for the position because only the candidate recommended by the ST Advisory Panel was brought before it in accordance with customary practice. The handshake was subsequently registered in the Agency's online bid

system.

On or about November 24, 2020, Plaintiff initiated an assignment challenge for the Warsaw position. On or about February 11, 2021, a GTM/CDA assignment panel reviewed the standard documentation prepared for all assignments challenges, including the employee statements, the DS bureau statement, and employee assignment data. Finding no compelling reason to overturn the DS Assignments Recommendation Panel's decision, the GTM/CDA assignment panel unanimously approved the candidate who had been recommended by the ST Advisory Panel for the FP-02 Warsaw position.

Plaintiff subsequently appealed the GTM/CDA assignment panel's decision to the Director General. On March 3, 2021, Plaintiff received a communication from PDAS Merten denying his appeal. PDAS Merten instructed Plaintiff that, as a NOW bidder, he should focus on positions in the NOW bidding cycle. He also informed Plaintiff that if he continued to be unassigned, GTM would consider directing him into an assignment. Under 22 U.S.C. §3982(a)(1), the Agency may assign a Foreign Service employee to any position in which the employee is eligible to serve. Where an employee has not received a handshake, or vacant positions are not filled within a reasonable time, the Director General may direct the assignment (known as a "directed assignment") of an employee to a position for which the employee did not bid. Directed assignments are administrative actions to ensure the orderly, effective, and efficient operation of the Foreign Service's open assignments system. All Foreign Service assignments are ultimately subject to the needs of the Service.

**Interrogatory No. 3.5 (Krakow):** Plaintiff was not assigned to the FO-03 Political/Economic Officer in Krakow (a Foreign Service Generalist position) because he lacked the relevant experience and skills in political and economic reporting, which were critical for a

Political/Economic Officer position. Unlike Foreign Service Specialists like Plaintiff, Foreign Service Generalists (or Foreign Service Officers) are placed in one of five different career tracks or “cones”: Political, Economic, Consular, Management, and Public Diplomacy. While Foreign Service Generalists specialize in one specific cone, they routinely serve in assignments outside of their cones to broaden their expertise. Unlike Foreign Service Generalists or Officers, Foreign Service Specialists perform specialized functions—including providing technical, professional, or administrative services—outside of the five generalist cones. Plaintiff is a Foreign Service Specialist who has worked virtually exclusively as a DS security engineer. It would thus have been highly atypical for him to be selected for a Generalist position.

Each of the individuals who were selected for the Krakow Political/Economic Officer position were Foreign Service Generalists that had prior and recent experience as a Political, Economic, or Political/Economic Officer. Reena Patel, who had been an FO-03 since 2016, served tours as a Political Military Affairs Officer, a Political Officer, and a Consular Officer. Brendan Kyle Hatcher, who had been an FO-03 since 2011, previously served multiple tours as a Political/Economic Officer, a Political Officer, an Economic Officer, and a Consular Officer. When Hatcher broke the Krakow assignment in early February 2022, Erjon Kruja was selected as his replacement. Similarly, Kruja had served as a Political/Economic Officer in Europe, as well as a Political/Military Affairs Officer in Washington, D.C., before being assigned to Krakow. To the contrary, Plaintiff had no experience as a Political/Economic Officer, a Political Officer, an Economic Officer, or an officer in any of the other remaining Generalist cones.

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

Identify all persons with knowledge concerning the questions raised by Mr. Lenzi about the removal of Catherine Warner from Guangzhou, China in 2018, the subsequent investigation of

her apartment, and the RSO-ordered counseling session to which Mr. Lenzi was subjected after Ms. Warner's removal, as described in at least paragraphs 37-45 of the First Amended Complaint.

**OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** In addition to the above objections to Definitions and Instructions, Defendants object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it improperly presents three (3) interrogatories on three different topics; accordingly, Defendants will count this interrogatory as three separate interrogatories. Defendants also object to this request because it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims in the case and is disproportionate to the needs of the case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Plaintiff's claims allege discrimination and retaliation regarding five overseas assignments, occurring between September 2019 at the earliest and July 2021 at the latest; this interrogatory requests information that both predates that time period and does not concern the assignment decisions challenged. Moreover, as written, this interrogatory would purport to require that Defendants interview "all persons"—without limitation—in order to determine whether such person had "knowledge concerning the questions raised by Mr. Lenzi." Such a request is not proportionate to the needs of the case, particularly when Plaintiff is the only one who can know the extent of his "questions raised." Defendants further object to "the questions raised by Mr. Lenzi" and "all persons with knowledge concerning" as vague and ambiguous. Defendants additionally assert a Privacy Act objection to the disclosure of information regarding "persons" not named as a party to this action. Defendants also object to the extent that this interrogatory would require the State Department to disclose information that is classified and thus may be protected by the state secrets privilege, as well as that information that is protected by the law enforcement privilege.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** Defendants stand on their objections.

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Identify persons with decision-making authority pertaining to and describe policies addressing public statements made by employees such as those described in paragraph 138 of the First Amended Complaint.

**OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** In addition to the above objections to Definition and Instructions, Defendants object to this interrogatory on the grounds and to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant and is not proportional to the needs of the case, considering the pending motion to dismiss Plaintiff's First Amendment claim for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Dkt. No. 29. Defendants further object to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information from before March 2019, the first instance of alleged First Amendment activity identified in the Complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 27 ¶ 138. Defendants objects to "such as those described in paragraph 138 of the First Amended Complaint" as vague and ambiguous, and similarly to "decision-making authority pertaining to," which could be read to ask who has the authority to make such policies or who has the authority to make decisions under such policies. Defendants also assert a Privacy Act objection to the disclosure of information regarding "persons" not named as a party to this action.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing

objections, and pursuant to the parties' meet and confer discussions to date, Defendants respond to this interrogatory as follows with respect to the State Department's policies on media engagement:

As authorized by the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, the Agency provides its process for the "Review of Public Speaking, Teaching, Writing, and Media Engagement" for "all personnel in the United States and abroad" that work for the "Department of State and United States Agency for International Development" at 3 FAM 4170. The Agency issued further guidance on the 3 FAM 4170 process via its internal "Social Media Hub" webpage in a February 17, 2017 document entitled "3 FAM 4170 Clarification." Additional FAM provisions are relevant when evaluating public communications, including 10 FAM 130, which concerns official communications on behalf of the Department, and 12 FAM 070, which assigns the Bureau of Diplomatic Security's Public Affairs Office (DS/DSS/PA) as the "sole conduit with the Bureau of Global Public Affairs (GPA) to address media inquiries related to DS and the Department's security and law enforcement activities." Department offices and bureaus frequently use official cables and other internal messages to underscore employee obligations to follow the 3 FAM 4170 process for all personal capacity communications of Departmental concern.

Pursuant to 3 FAM 4173.3, the Bureau of Public Affairs (now the Bureau of Global Public Affairs (GPA)) acts as the final reviewer for all personal capacity communications of Departmental concern and GPA has assigned this responsibility to the Managing Director for International Media. Personnel employed in the United States seeking review of personal capacity public communications either send them to a shared GPA email account, directly to a "GPA Reviews" database, or through their individual Bureau's Public Affairs Officer. Those posted overseas seek



review from their Embassy leadership and Public Affairs Section, which then routes the communication to GPA for review as needed.

Additionally, pursuant to Federal Rule 33(d), Defendants refer Plaintiff to the media engagement policies that have been produced at the Bates numbers identified in Attachment B.

Dated: September 26, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

JESSICA D. ABER  
United States Attorney

BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

LAUREN A. WETZLER  
Chief, Civil Division

CARLOTTA P. WELLS  
Assistant Branch Director

/s/  
MATTHEW J. MEZGER  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Office of the United States Attorney  
2100 Jamieson Avenue  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Tel: (703) 299-3741  
Fax: (703) 299-3983  
Email: matthew.mezger@usdoj.gov

JOSEPH BORSON  
CATHERINE M. YANG  
Trial Attorneys  
United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: (202) 514-1944/4336  
Email: Joseph.Borson@usdoj.gov  
Catherine.M.Yang@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for Defendants*

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information I provided in response to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022


/s/ John Fitzsimmons

Former Deputy Assistant Secretary and Assistant Director,  
Countermeasures Directorate

Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Department of State

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information I provided in response to Interrogatories Nos. 1 and 3 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Am K...', written over a solid horizontal line.

Security Engineering Officer and former Career  
Development Officer

Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Department of State

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information I provided in response to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022

Nathan H  
Lingenfelter

Digitally signed by Nathan H  
Lingenfelter  
Date: 2022.09.26 15:52:22 -04'00'

Security Engineering Office and former Career  
Development Officer

Bureau of Diplomatic Security, U.S. Department of State

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information I provided in response to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 3 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022

Patrick T. Slowinski


/s/ Patrick Slowinski

Former Consul General, U.S. Consulate General in Krakow

Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, U.S. Department  
of State

I hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the information I provided in response to Interrogatory No. 5 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022

  
/s/ Elizabeth E. Detmeister

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) for  
Strategic Messaging and Managing Director for  
International Media

Bureau of Global Public Affairs, U.S. Department of  
State



**PX-003**



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

-----  
)  
MARK LENZI, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) Civil Action  
vs. )  
) No. 1:21-cv-01371  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT ) PTG-IDD  
OF STATE, AND ANTONY J. )  
BLINKEN, UNITED STATES )  
SECRETARY OF STATE, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
-----)

DEPOSITION OF RONALD STUART  
Washington, DC  
October 14, 2022

Reported by: John L. Harmonson, RPR  
Job No. 884870

1

2

3

4

5

October 14, 2022

6

7:58 a.m.

7

8

9

Deposition of RONALD STUART, taken at the  
offices of Steptoe & Johnson LLP, 1330  
Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, DC, pursuant  
to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, subject  
to such stipulations as may be recited herein or  
attached hereto, before John L. Harmonson, a  
Registered Professional Reporter and Notary  
Public of the District of Columbia, who  
officiated in administering the oath to the  
witness.

19

20

21

22

A P P E A R A N C E S

On behalf of Plaintiff:

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.429.3000

BY: CHRISTOPHER A. SUAREZ, ESQ.  
SHANNON REID, ESQ.  
THOMAS M. BARBA, ESQ.  
csuarez@steptoe.com  
sreid@steptoe.com  
tbarba@steptoe.com

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP  
1114 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
212.506.3900

BY: KATE E. FISCH, ESQ.  
kfisch@steptoe.com

On behalf of Defendants:

US DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
Office of the Legal Adviser  
2201 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20520  
202.647.5036

BY: JASON C. ROBERTS, ESQ.  
robertsjc2@state.gov

1 APPEARANCES (Cont.'d)

2

3 US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

2100 Jamieson Avenue

4 Alexandria, VA 22314

703.299.3700

5 BY: MATTHEW J. MEZGER, ESQ.

matthew.mezger@usdoj.gov

6

7

8 ALSO PRESENT:

9 APRIL CARTER, Videographer

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## 1 EXAMINATION INDEX

2 WITNESS PAGE

3 RONALD STUART

4 Examination by Mr. Suarez 8

5 \* \* \*

6

## 7 EXHIBIT INDEX

8 EXHIBIT NO. PAGE

9 Exhibit 1 Email; STATE00012117 63

10 Exhibit 2 Email; STATE00011695 - 11697 84

11 Exhibit 3 Email; STATE00011687 - 11690 101

12 Exhibit 4 Excerpt from Foreign Affairs 115

13 Manual, 5 FAM 870 Networks

14 Exhibit 5 Email; STATE00011649 - 11652 136

15 Exhibit 6 Email; STATE00011644 146

16 Exhibit 7 Email; STATE00011699 - 11700 152

17 Exhibit 8 Email; STATE00011640 - 11641 156

18 Exhibit 9 Email; STATE00011635 - 11636 167

19 Exhibit 10 Email; STATE00011309 - 11310 184

20 Exhibit 11 Photograph; STATE00011148 216

21 Exhibit 12 Email; STATE00011087 - 11097 218

22 Exhibit 13 Email; STATE00011075 - 11077 226

1	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.'d)		
2	EXHIBIT NO.		PAGE
3	Exhibit 14	Email; STATE00012036	228
4	Exhibit 15	Email; STATE00011045 - 11047	233
5	Exhibit 16	Affidavit; STATE00000575 - 589	246
6	Exhibit 17	Affidavit; LENZI0003175 - 3183	246
7	Exhibit 18	DS Combined Recommendations	277
8		Panel Report; STATE00007981 -	
9		8021	
10	Exhibit 19	Email; STATE00008914	289
11	Exhibit 20	Email; STATE00009508 - 9510	361
12	Exhibit 21	Screenshot	369
13	Exhibit 22	Email; STATE00008588 - 8590	372
14	Exhibit 23	Email; STATE00009212	382
15	Exhibit 24	Email; STATE00009235	385
16	Exhibit 25	Email; STATE00009302 - 9305	396
17	Exhibit 26	Email; STATE00011015 - 11034	404
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

1 -----

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 MORNING SESSION

4 7:58 a.m.

5 -----

6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We  
7 are now on the record. This begins videotape  
8 1 in the deposition of Ronald Stuart, in the  
9 matter of Mark Lenzi v. US Department of State,  
10 et al., in the US District Court, Eastern  
11 District of Virginia, Alexandria Division.

12 Today is October 14, 2022, and the  
13 time is 7:58 a.m. This deposition is being taken  
14 at 1330 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest,  
15 Washington, DC 20036.

16 The videographer is April Carter of  
17 Magna Legal Services, and the court reporter is  
18 John Harmonson of Magna Legal Services.

19 Will counsel and all parties present  
20 state their appearances and whom they represent.

21 MR. SUAREZ: Good morning. My name is  
22 Christopher Suarez from Steptoe & Johnson on

1     behalf of plaintiff Mark Lenzi. With me today is  
2     Shannon Reid, also from Steptoe & Johnson.

3                   THE WITNESS: Ronald Stuart for the  
4     Department of State.

5                   MR. MEZGER: Matthew Mezger with  
6     Department of Justice on behalf of the witness  
7     and Department of State, and joining me is Jason  
8     Roberts from the Department of State.

9                   THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.

10                   Will the court reporter please swear  
11     in the witness.

12                                   \* \* \*

13     Whereupon:

14                                   RONALD STUART,  
15     after having been first duly sworn or affirmed,  
16     was examined and did testify under oath as  
17     follows:

18                                   EXAMINATION

19     BY MR. SUAREZ:

20             Q.     Good morning, Mr. Stuart. How are you  
21     doing?

22             A.     I'm well, thank you. Yourself?



1           Q.       So it wasn't just Mr. Lenzi who got  
2   med-evac'd for what came to be known as Havana  
3   syndrome, it was also this other individual in  
4   the adjoining apartment; right?

5           A.       I don't know -- and again, I don't  
6   know technically if it was adjoining or where it  
7   was. But I do know there was another person that  
8   was close to his apartment, whether it was  
9   adjoining, adjacent, above, below, but it was in  
10  the similar vicinity, yes.

11          Q.       Now, you had mentioned before that  
12  your wife wasn't interested in going to China.  
13  What were her concerns about going to China?

14          A.       I don't know. She just -- it was one  
15  of those places she had never been interested in  
16  living in.

17          Q.       Now, why did you get involved in 2018  
18  such that you had a conversation with Mr. Lenzi  
19  on the phone, or have two conversations with  
20  Mr. Lenzi on the phone?

21          A.       So my position in 2018 at the time, I  
22  was ST, Office of Security Technology, where the

1 majority of the SEOs work. I was the operations  
2 director, which meant that the overseas -- our  
3 overseas staff eventually reported up through me.  
4 So I was responsible for our overseas staff. And  
5 I'm responsible for them from the Security  
6 Technology Operations division as that director  
7 to five regional directors.

8 Those regional directors then were  
9 responsible for the ESCs, engineering services  
10 center, which is a larger office. And the ESCs  
11 are responsible for the ESOs, or engineering  
12 services security offices. And then there are a  
13 few TSOs, technical security offices, that fall  
14 under them which are the OICs, officer in charge.  
15 They're SGSSs, very junior officers.

16 So Mr. Lenzi was at an ESO in  
17 Guangzhou which would report to ESE Beijing,  
18 which would go to the RD from Bangkok, which  
19 would then come to me. I was told that something  
20 was going on with him, and I felt it my place to  
21 be able to commit the government for expense to  
22 get him out of his house.

1                   And then it says: "John. Post RSO,  
2   in consultation with SRSO Beijing, decided today  
3   to restrict Mark's access to the F building based  
4   on his erratic behavior and his mental health."

5                   Do you see that?

6           A.       Yes.

7           Q.       So who would post RSO and SRSO Beijing  
8   be referring to?

9           A.       So the post RSO Rahim is referring to  
10   is Judy Lim from Guangzhou in consultation with  
11   the senior regional security officer Beijing,  
12   which is Andrew Wroblewski.

13          Q.       So I want to be precise. They  
14   restricted his access at this time?

15          A.       Correct.

16          Q.       Okay. And that was done based on his  
17   medical situation with erratic behavior and  
18   mental health; right?

19          A.       According to this, yes.

20          Q.       "He can still access the compound and  
21   med unit, but needs to coordinate with RSO if he  
22   wants to access the F building."

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Okay. So is that where his ClassNet  
3 would have been?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. So basically as of this  
6 May 29th date, he wasn't allowed to access  
7 ClassNet; right?

8 A. No, that's not what it's saying. It's  
9 saying that he would have to have somebody escort  
10 him or coordinate with the RSO to get into the F  
11 building to access that and he wouldn't be able  
12 to freely to go there on his own volition.

13 Q. You understand that Mr. Lenzi has not  
14 had access to ClassNet for the last four years;  
15 right?

16 A. I have understanding that in his  
17 domestic assignments, he hasn't had -- he hasn't  
18 been in an assignment that required access to  
19 classified information. I don't know that he's  
20 been denied access, but I do know that his  
21 assignments haven't required that.

22 Q. And baked into a decision to place

1 STATE00011635 to 636.

2 (Exhibit 9 marked for identification  
3 and attached hereto.)

4 BY MR. SUAREZ:

5 Q. I'm going to start three email downs.  
6 There is an email from Judy Lim on May 29, 2018,  
7 at 8:55 p.m. Do you see that one?

8 A. 8:39?

9 Q. No. The one at 8:55 on the first  
10 page, three down.

11 A. Yep.

12 Q. So it says: "I spoke with our PAS  
13 officer who is friends with Mark and has been  
14 texting with him. As expected, Mark is pretty  
15 upset he does not have free access to F  
16 building."

17 Do you see that?

18 A. I see that.

19 Q. So that is a reference to the  
20 restriction on him having access to classified  
21 information at this time; right?

22 A. Accessing the entirety of the CA

1 building. It's more than just classified  
2 information.

3 Q. By the way, you mentioned official  
4 channels earlier. You know what the OSC is,  
5 right, Office of Special Counsel?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. You would agree that's an official  
8 channel to lodge a complaint; right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Lenzi  
11 has raised a complaint with the OSC in the past  
12 regarding his revocation of access to ClassNet?

13 A. I am aware that there was a complaint.  
14 I didn't know the exact specifics of it.

15 Q. So would it surprise you that there  
16 was a complaint to the OSC about that?

17 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

18 The witness may answer.

19 THE WITNESS: "Surprise" is the wrong  
20 term for me. Mr. Lenzi has numerous avenues of  
21 areas to dissent, complain, et cetera.  
22 "Complain" is the wrong word. Voice his

1 concerns. And that is one of them. So he's  
2 utilizing them all.

3 BY MR. SUAREZ:

4 Q. And you agree that that's a valid one  
5 to use; right?

6 A. Correct. Yes, I do.

7 Q. All right. Let's go to the email  
8 above it. Andrew Wroblewski, Rahim Theriot,  
9 9:37 p.m. on May 29th. "We received this message  
10 from IP."

11 Who is IP?

12 A. International Programs. So within the  
13 directorate of Diplomatic Security, one of the  
14 directorates is International Programs.

15 Q. Okay. Is that in the main State  
16 office in DC?

17 A. No. So that's in DS in Rosslyn in  
18 SA20. Our overseas office within DS from the  
19 agent side are overseen by two different  
20 organizations, International Programs and  
21 High-Threat Programs.

22 Q. And this says: "The secretary has

1 asked the DS assistant secretary to convey to  
2 post that, effective immediately, Mark Lenzi's  
3 access to OpenNet should be rescinded." Right?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. So to be clear, this was coming from  
6 Pompeo; right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So Pompeo himself said, at least as of  
9 this time frame, he shouldn't even get into  
10 OpenNet; right?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. So again, highest levels of the  
13 department making decisions about Mr. Lenzi;  
14 right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Who is DS assistant secretary?

17 A. Can I see this one?

18 MR. MEZGER: The witness asked for  
19 Exhibit 8.

20 THE WITNESS: 7.

21 MR. MEZGER: The witness asked for  
22 Exhibit 7.



1                   The witness may answer.

2                   THE WITNESS:   5 percent-ish.

3   BY MR. SUAREZ:

4           Q.       Okay.   So 95 percent of SEOs have  
5   access to ClassNet.   Is that correct,  
6   approximately?

7           A.       Approximately.

8           Q.       Okay.   So are you aware of -- you  
9   testified that the ones who are not in positions  
10   that require ClassNet are the ones who don't have  
11   access to ClassNet.

12          A.       Correct.

13          Q.       Are you aware of any SEO who is in a  
14   position that requires ClassNet but for whom  
15   their ClassNet access has been restricted or  
16   revoked?

17          A.       To clarify that, they're in a position  
18   currently that requires this and they're not  
19   allowed to access that?

20          Q.       Right.

21          A.       No.   Because they would be moved out  
22   of that kind of position.   The individuals that

1     there is an OIC position, great for him, somebody  
2     ought to inform him. That would be a better word  
3     than offer. Somebody should inform him that this  
4     is an OIC position at grade. We say overseas  
5     even though it's in Mexico. It's not technically  
6     overseas, but for the department it's an overseas  
7     position.

8           Q.     So back to the question. With whom  
9     amongst the seniors did you have this discussion  
10    about informing Mr. Lenzi that Monterrey was an  
11    option?

12          A.     All of our division directors at the  
13    time. During an advisory panel, we would have  
14    discussed open assignments. And so it would have  
15    been Tamika Abbott, an STO. Rahim Theriot at  
16    that point was in training. I'm fairly certain  
17    Jim Nicodemus was the FSE division director. And  
18    there's one other, and I don't know who. It  
19    might have been Mark Graves.

20          Q.     And who were the two individuals who  
21    you believe informed Mr. Lenzi about this  
22    position?

1 informed of his DRAD exceptions or accommodations  
2 for his current assignment, or the past two  
3 assignments domestically.

4 Q. You're aware at one time Mr. Lenzi had  
5 a Class 1 medical clearance?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And then he applied to a position in  
8 Frankfurt. Do you recall that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And then after he applied for the  
11 position in Frankfurt, he was moved to a Class 5.  
12 Do you remember that?

13 A. I didn't know he was moved to a  
14 Class 5.

15 Q. Are you familiar with a situation --  
16 or did you know that Mr. Lenzi at one point was  
17 moved from a Class 1 directly to a Class 5  
18 medical clearance?

19 A. No. Class 5 would be domestic only.

20 Q. Right. Are you aware of any situation  
21 ever where someone has been moved from a Class 1  
22 medical clearance directly to a Class 5?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. What were those situations?

3 A. I know some people that have had a  
4 stroke, a heart attack.

5 Q. So usually there's an intervening  
6 medical event between a shift from a Class 1  
7 medical clearance directly to a Class 5; right?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. So it would be kind of odd if a  
10 medical clearance was changed directly from  
11 Class 1 to Class 5 if there was not an  
12 intervening medical event; right?

13 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

14 The witness may answer.

15 THE WITNESS: Maybe. I don't do the  
16 medical clearance. My assumption would be that  
17 would be odd.

18 Now, you can get a Class 5 medical  
19 clearance for spouses or children as well that  
20 affects your assignments, which means we cannot  
21 assign you to a certain place because of your  
22 family members.

1 BY MR. SUAREZ:

2 Q. Okay. So now other than the position  
3 in Monterrey, is there any other position you're  
4 aware of where Mr. Lenzi was informed that he  
5 could bid on and receive the position?

6 A. I think saying "bid on and receive the  
7 position" -- when we informed him, it wasn't  
8 guaranteed he would receive the position. We  
9 informed him this was at grade, in cone, that met  
10 what he needed under the department's bidding  
11 guidelines. It still has to go through the DS  
12 panel and the HR panel.

13 Q. So he wouldn't even have been  
14 guaranteed Monterrey?

15 A. Correct. It was our advisory side  
16 where we would have fed to the DS panel that we  
17 advised that Mr. Lenzi meets the criteria to go  
18 to this post.

19 Q. Right. And in fact, you were on the  
20 advisory panel when Mr. Lenzi applied for a  
21 Frankfurt position; right?

22 A. Correct.

1 Q. Does that refresh your recollection  
2 that he was broken out of a Baku assignment?

3 A. No. But it does make sense that he  
4 would have gone to Baku.

5 Q. Okay. And again, this in 2018 we are  
6 talking about, that like he got med-evac'd in the  
7 middle of 2018 and any plans to go to Baku would  
8 have been disrupted; right?

9 A. They would have been disrupted.

10 Q. And after this he was placed on  
11 overcomplement status; right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. So what's a Y tour?

14 A. An out-of-assignment kind of tour.

15 Within Security Technology we had an IRM person,  
16 information resource management person, that is  
17 an IRM specialist that came to work for us in an  
18 SEO position as a radio specialist. But since he  
19 doesn't have that skill code to be within that  
20 tour, they assigned him a Y tour.

21 And a Y tour for an SEO could be  
22 somewhere where we don't have an office

1 potentially to -- we have assigned an STS to a  
2 post before that we didn't have an STS assigned  
3 to so we created a Y tour, which is kind of an  
4 out-of-normal numerical number for a position  
5 tour. GTM can give you an exact definition.

6 Q. Okay. What is the difference between  
7 a Y tour and overcomplement status?

8 A. I don't know.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. There is a difference, yes, but...

11 Q. You're just not privy to the  
12 differences?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Okay, fair enough.

15 So I want to look at the bottom email  
16 on the first page at 11087. It's from someone  
17 named Michele Crone to Mark Lenzi and  
18 Lingenfelter.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. It actually looks like his wife might  
21 be on it as well, Kristalin. Do you see that?

22 A. Yes.

1 Q. -- for consideration?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And as the chair, you did not say  
4 anything during the meeting to disqualify  
5 Mr. Lenzi from consideration for the Frankfurt  
6 position; right?

7 A. No.

8 Q. And you reviewed Mr. Lenzi's  
9 credentials and qualifications to be considered  
10 for the Frankfurt positions?

11 A. Not that in-depth. I mean, he's an  
12 SEO. He's at grade. He can serve at this kind  
13 of position. I mean, it's assumed his  
14 credentials and everything else already exist.

15 Q. Got it.

16 But from your perspective, as of the  
17 time the panel met on October 22, 2019, you saw  
18 no reason that Mr. Lenzi should have been  
19 precluded from being allowed to go to one of the  
20 two vacant FP-03 positions in Frankfurt; right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. What role does the panel play in



1                   The witness may answer.

2                   THE WITNESS: My answer would be the  
3 complainant alleged the two positions remained  
4 open for six months, yes.

5 BY MR. SUAREZ:

6           Q.       Okay. Thank you.

7                   So then "Complainant alleged on or  
8 about March 3" --

9           A.       One second. When I say complainant  
10 alleged these, and then I say yes, I don't know  
11 if they alleged that or not. But what I can say  
12 is the two positions more than likely remained  
13 open for six months, yes.

14          Q.       Understood. Thank you.

15                   So now looking at 28. "Complainant  
16 alleged on or about March 3, 2020, the DS/ST  
17 assignment panel made the decision to make the  
18 two positions unavailable for at-grade bidders."

19                   Do you see that?

20          A.       I see that.

21          Q.       And so you state: "The two FS-03  
22 positions remained open until February. Advisory

1 panel recommended the positions be designated as  
2 two of the three required options for the 156th  
3 specialist class."

4 So they were moved from the vacancy  
5 list for that reason; right?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And so the idea was that they were  
8 reassigned to be entry-level positions; right?

9 A. As FS-03 is the most junior position  
10 we have anywhere in the world, they count for  
11 entry level all the way through, like, until  
12 you're making 2. So whether you're a 6, 5, 4 or  
13 3, you're bidding on 3-level positions.

14 Q. Got it.

15 And you agreed that the two positions  
16 remained open until February; right?

17 A. Correct. Well, they were still active  
18 on the standard bid list. Entry level is a whole  
19 other thing. So they weren't available -- the  
20 entry level, they were available for midlevel  
21 employees to bid on.

22 Q. What happened to the FP-02 and 01

1 supervision to start their career. Because we do  
2 have 3-level positions that are more senior  
3 junior-level at some very small ESO offices.

4 Q. And you say in 32 that two domestic  
5 and two junior positions at an ESC were ceded;  
6 right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And so to be clear for the record, the  
9 only overseas positions that were ceded out of  
10 all of the positions correspond to the position  
11 Mr. Lenzi had been offered to get; right?

12 A. He hadn't been offered. He had  
13 been -- we had advised the DS panel -- Mr. Lenzi  
14 would not be aware of any of this, but we had  
15 recommended him for that. And the two positions  
16 that were available, I think, within the ESCs at  
17 that time were Frankfurt.

18 Q. Got it.

19 And so to be clear for the record, the  
20 only overseas positions that were ceded,  
21 c-e-d-e-d, out of all the positions that were  
22 being considered by the panel were the two

1 positions that corresponded to Mr. Lenzi's grade  
2 and for which the panel had recommended he  
3 advance; right?

4 A. Only two positions that were ceded out  
5 of the availability of -- on the DS panel, the HR  
6 panel, the positions available, the two were  
7 Frankfurt, yes, for overseas.

8 Q. And again, that just happened to  
9 coincide with the one that Mr. Lenzi had been  
10 recommended to receive?

11 MR. MEZGER: Object.

12 THE WITNESS: From my recollection,  
13 there were no additional overseas assignments at  
14 the FS or FP-3 level.

15 BY MR. SUAREZ:

16 Q. And again, that was just a  
17 coincidence; right?

18 MR. MEZGER: Object to form.

19 The witness may answer.

20 THE WITNESS: I don't think it -- I  
21 don't know if it's a coincidence or not. It's  
22 just the way it works out sometimes.

1 with that, because they turn it into this.

2 Q. Now, most of the people on here, it  
3 says AP; right?

4 A. The first two pages, there is one  
5 each, deferred. Everybody else is AP, yes.

6 Q. So it's fair to say the vast majority  
7 of people who go before this panel get approved;  
8 right?

9 A. I do see several DEFs and several not  
10 approveds.

11 Q. Well, let's --

12 A. The next page is then yes, yes, going  
13 through a significant number of approveds or APs.

14 Q. It looks like you can do the counting  
15 and check my math, but each page seems to have  
16 approximately ten positions; right? It looks  
17 like it varies 10 to 12, depending on the page.

18 A. Yes. You can see some highlighted on  
19 page STATE8008 where it actually says withdraw or  
20 WDR, and the next page says defer or DEF. So DEF  
21 is defer.

22 Q. Over 90 percent of the people in here

1 are approved; right?

2 A. It does look that way.

3 Q. Okay. So now going briefly to  
4 STATE8020.

5 A. Which STATE?

6 Q. 8020.

7 A. Uh-huh.

8 Q. So that says "Extension Requests."

9 Right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So we were talking about this earlier.  
12 To go beyond one or two years that's typical, you  
13 have to put in these extension requests to get  
14 approved; right?

15 A. To go beyond -- the majority of the  
16 jobs of these overseas are three years. But yes,  
17 to go beyond whatever your assignment was, you  
18 need an extension request.

19 Q. And so those extension requests go  
20 through the panel as well; right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And the first two, there is an

1           Q.       Number 8 says: "Are you aware of  
2   whether or not the complainant suffers from any  
3   medical conditions or impairments?"

4                   And you state: "I am aware that mild  
5   traumatic brain injury is one of the medical  
6   issues."   Right?

7           A.       Correct.

8           Q.       So that's consistent with your earlier  
9   testimony that you've been aware of his injury,  
10   medical situation since around May of 2018;  
11   right?

12          A.       More details.   I was getting more and  
13   more details as this goes on.

14          Q.       You knew he had a medical condition as  
15   of May 2018, but now at this point you're also  
16   aware of a diagnosis of mild traumatic brain  
17   injury; right?

18          A.       Correct.

19          Q.       And then it says: "When and how did  
20   you become aware of the complainant's medical  
21   condition?"

22                   "The department notified his branch

1 Q. You're not aware if they related to  
2 his ability to be accommodated in Monterrey?

3 A. Correct, I'm not aware.

4 Q. So why do you not have any discomfort  
5 with Mr. Lenzi taking a foreign post assignment?

6 A. I think he's a qualified SEO. I think  
7 he's served admirably for us in these domestic  
8 positions he's been in as well as the overseas  
9 positions. I think he went outside department  
10 guidelines when he wasn't getting answers that he  
11 was looking for in China. But I can empathize  
12 and I understand that, while I may disagree with  
13 it since the department has bona fide methods for  
14 dissent. I don't know of any physical  
15 restriction that would keep him from doing his  
16 job.

17 Q. So you're not aware of any physical or  
18 medical restriction that would prevent him from  
19 serving as an SEO overseas?

20 A. Correct. If he's given a Class 1  
21 medical clearance, even a Class 2 medical  
22 clearance, he can serve. Class 2 the majority of



1 Q. Got it.

2 So this one was not about the  
3 distinction between now and the summer?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Okay. 46. "Were there changes to  
6 complainant's qualifications that denied him the  
7 bid to serve at the Warsaw post?"

8 Your answer: "I am unaware of any  
9 changes to the complainant's qualifications."  
10 Right?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. So consistent with your prior  
13 testimony, there was no reason from a  
14 qualification or medical capacity standpoint that  
15 Mr. Lenzi could not have served in Warsaw; right?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. 48. It says: "Who made the decision  
18 to deny complainant bidding on serving at the  
19 Warsaw post?"

20 You say: "I am unaware if or how a  
21 decision was made to deny the complainant bidding  
22 on the position." Right?

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

3 I, JOHN L. HARMONSON, a Notary Public  
4 within and for the District of Columbia, do  
5 hereby certify that RONALD STUART, the witness  
6 whose deposition is hereinbefore set forth, was  
7 duly sworn by me and that such deposition is a  
8 true record of the testimony given by such  
9 witness.

10 That before completion of the  
11 proceedings, review and signature of the  
12 transcript was reserved.

13 I further certify that I am not related  
14 to any of the parties to this action by blood or  
15 marriage; and that I am in no way interested in  
16 the outcome of this matter.

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
18 my hand this 25th day of October, 2022.

19

20

*John Harmonson*

21

JOHN L. HARMONSON, RPR

22

My commission expires: 04/14/26

**PX-004**

Message

**From:** Lenzi, Mark R (Portsmouth NH) [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=695943D2B9BD4DCA831F83701E1083FD-LENZI, MARK]  
**Sent:** 9/30/2020 2:11:50 PM  
**To:** Kaleczyc, Andrew W [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=6a0071707ab04b9986fc33784dd0536b-Kaleczyc, A]  
**Subject:** Re: bidding/assignments discussion  
**Attachments:** 20200930\_094058.jpg

Hi Andy:

Thanks for the email. (I think we may have been in contact when I was in Guangzhou and you were in Japan (?) but I'm not sure about that.)

Regarding bidding, thank you for your pro-active email to work with me before bids are due October 16. Especially because of my Disability and Reasonable Accommodation and security considerations, over the past summer I have spent countless hours researching posts and working with multiple posts' medical units and RSOs on researching bids at my grade. Somewhat surprisingly, it turns out that Embassy Belgrade is the post that is by far the best fit of all the specific medical, DRAD, security, etc. criteria for me and my family. Please see below which is from a draft of my BPS. I will submit the final BPS to you well before October 16.

There is one important issue I wanted to bring to your attention and have you look into prior to October 16. I have a an active EEO complaint against the ST Assignments Panel for discrimination (see attached) and my claims of discrimination have been formally accepted by the Department. Because this is an active EEO complaint, it is my belief that members of last year's assignment's panel should recuse themselves from this year's assignment's panel when considering my assignment. I would ask that you speak with GTM about this and possibly have a solution where another panel such as for Special Agents decides my assignment. It is not fair nor is it ethical to have the same ST assignment panel members from last year that committed discrimination and retaliation against me in a position to again commit discrimination and retaliation. So I would please ask that you speak with others in GTM about this and perhaps a CDO for Special Agents and depending on GTM's proposed resolution I will have my employment lawyer involved in this process.

Yes, I would very much like to have a call/Teams meeting with you. I have a lot of brain injury doctors appointments this week so perhaps next Tuesday we could speak via Teams?

Thanks and best regards,  
Mark

(SBU/PII) For reasons known to DS leadership that include *inter alia* my involvement with FBI in the Mueller investigation when I was injured in 2018, one of the most important bidding considerations for my family is to live in housing that is observed by DS Surveillance Detection guards and is near to post. After discussion with multiple RSOs, Embassy Belgrade is best

suited for security and housing considerations. The Health Unit and working conditions (including amount of ESO constituent posts) at Embassy Belgrade is also best suited to accommodate the provisions in my Disability and Reasonable Accommodation (DRAD). Working at Embassy Belgrade would be by far the best of any potential posts for security, medical, HR/OAA/DRAD, and Department of Labor (DoL) Workers Compensation considerations.

(SBU) Unable to use bidding privileges from Guangzhou because my wife and I were both medevac'd with brain injuries, there is a chance that our medical clearances could be downgraded to Class 2 and Embassy Belgrade is aware of this possibility and best able to accommodate if that happened.

(SBU) I have the support of EUR DAS Matthew Palmer for this bid to Embassy Belgrade. I worked Serbian issues for EUR/SCE before joining the Foreign Service, have a working knowledge of Serbo-Croatian and have worked extensively in Serbia and Kosovo. I would be happy to provide numerous other high level DoS references for this bid to Emb Belgrade.

---

**From:** Kaleczyc, Andrew W <KaleczycA@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 4:51 PM  
**To:** Lenzi, Mark R (Portsmouth NH) <LenziMR@state.gov>  
**Subject:** bidding/assignments discussion

Hi Mark,  
My name is Andy and I am the new CDO replacing Nathan Lingenfelter.  
I would like to work with you on identifying potential assignments that are a good fit for you, whether domestic or overseas. Would you be interested in a telephone or Teams call to discuss? The Summer 2021 bid list posted last week and if there are positions you're interested in then I'd like to advocate on your behalf as early in the process as possible, before assignments start going to other bidders.  
I look forward to hearing back from you.  
Regards,  
Andy

**PX-005**

1/31/22, 10:51 AM

HROnline Report Print

Department of State  
EMPLOYEE PROFILE

Report ID: EMPLOYEE PROFILE

Page No. 1  
Run Date: 01/31/2022  
Run Time: 10:49:11

Name: LENZIMARK R

LEGLRS: NH  
HMLVRES: NH  
BIRTHPL: NH  
TEN: 1  
TYPE APPT: Career (Competitive Svc Perm)  
TOURTYTP: E - 2 YRS/TRANSFER  
SKILL1: 2550 SECURITY ENGINEERING  
SKILL2: 2550 SECURITY ENGINEERING  
SKILL3:  
DIPLOMATIC TITLE: -  
MARITAL ST: M  
SCD: 10/17/2009  
EOD-FS: 08/14/2011  
EOD-DP: 08/14/2011  
PP-CL: FP 03  
EMP PROGRAM: Not Applicable  
SALARY: \$127,205.00  
TED:10/29/2023  
EXLIMAPP:  
CURORG: 175213 - DS/FSE/FSB  
POSNO: \$6216104  
ST: A  
SEX: M  
VET: 1  
STEP: 10  
AGN: ST 00  
WGI DUE:11/05/2023  
FEGLI: D0  
FEHB: 402

PAST ASSIGN	DATE	POSITION SKILL	POSITION TITLE	WORKING TITLE	GRADE	DATE
DS/FSE/FSB	10/21	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING		FP 03	11/16
DS/NOC	10/21	REASSIGNMENT	REASSIGNMENT		FP 04	03/14
DS/NOC	12/18	REASSIGNMENT	REASSIGNMENT		FP 05	08/12
BEIJING	08/16	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING		FP 06	08/11
FRANKFURT	09/14	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING			
DS/CMP/TSC	08/13	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING			
DS/CMP/ECB	09/11	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING			
HR/FSSI	08/11	SECURITY ENGINEERING	SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING			

DETAIL (TEMPORARY DUTY) HISTORY

PAST ASSIGN	DATE	POSITION SKILL	POSITION TITLE	WORKING TITLE	NTE
LANGUAGES					
RU - Russian	SP/RD 2 2+	DATE 09/11	DATE 09/11	AWARDS FRANKLIN AWARD	DATE 04/2016
UK - Ukrainian	1 1	09/17	09/17	GROUP FRANKLIN AWARD	06/2015

MLAT:

DEPENDENT NAME	RELATION	DOB	COURSE	EMP-IN-SERV-TRAIN	DATE
			EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	02/23/2021
			EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	03/04/2020
			PA296	How to be a Contracting Office	05/24/2019
			PP468	Promoting Intl. Religious Free	03/07/2019
			EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	01/28/2019
			EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	08/22/2017
			PK323	Classified and SBU Info: ID an	11/18/2016
			EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	09/02/2016

WARNING: Disclose to Authorized Persons Only (22CFR 6A)  
Contains Information Protected by the Privacy Act of 1974

https://hrweb.hr.state.sbu/prd/hronline/circuits/EP/index.cfm?action=report.ee\_profile&menuID=18

1/31/22, 10:51 AM

## HROnline Report Print

Department of State  
EMPLOYEE PROFILEReport ID: EMPLOYEE PROFILE  
Oprid: thompsonj2  
Emplid: 157155  
Name: LENZIMARK RPage No. 1  
Run Date: 01/31/2022  
Run Time: 10:49:11

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>EMP-IN-SERV-TRAIN</u>	<u>DATE</u>
EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	09/30/2015
PK323	Classified and SBU Info: ID an	09/30/2015
EX250	Counterintelligence Awareness	09/30/2014
MQ911	SOS: Security Overseas Seminar	08/05/2014
TT101	Overseas Security Engineering	12/04/2013
PT401	No FEAR Act Training	11/19/2013
SE102	Basic Security Engineering Off	11/30/2012
18290	TSCM Fundamentals	11/21/2012
SE425	TSCM Essentials 2	08/30/2012
CSCNTAT12	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Network	06/20/2012
CSCNTA11	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Trblsho	06/15/2012
CSCNTA09	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Routing	06/13/2012
CSCNTA08	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Network	05/29/2012
CSCNTA06	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Wide Ar	05/24/2012
CSCNTA07	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Wireles	05/24/2012
CSCNTA05	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Network	05/22/2012
SE293	CU-50 Alarm System In-Service	05/11/2012
PT227	Managing Your Time Effectively	04/04/2012
OT610	Foreign Affairs Counter Threat	12/09/2011
MGMT34A01	Recognize/Diagnose Problem Per	11/30/2011
TEAM03A04	Leading Teams: Bldg Trust and	11/30/2011
MGMT07A03	Managing Delegation	11/29/2011
PROJ16A01	Introduction to Program Manage	11/29/2011
MGMT19A01	Transitioning from Technical P	11/28/2011
MGMT19A02	Strategies for Transitioning t	11/28/2011
MGMT19A03	Managing Technical Professiona	11/28/2011
MGMT23A02	Cross-Functional Strategic Man	11/28/2011
SE292	Protector Alarm System In-Serv	11/15/2011
CSCNTA03	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Network	10/31/2011
CSCNTA02	CompTIA Ntwk+ 09: Network Comp	10/26/2011
PA296	How to be a Contracting Office	10/24/2011
CSCNTA01	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Network	10/21/2011
PK323	Classified and SBU Info: ID an	10/21/2011
CSCNTA10	CompTIA Network+ 2009: Mng and	10/19/2011
SPETHA08	Cryptography (2)	10/18/2011
CSAPITA04	A+ Practical Appl 2009: Mainta	10/04/2011
CSAPITA05	A+ Practical Application 2009:	10/04/2011

WARNING: Disclose to Authorized Persons Only (22CFR 6A)  
Contains Information Protected by the Privacy Act of 1974

https://hrweb.hr.state.sbu/prd/hronline/circuits/EP/index.cfm?action=report.ee\_profile&amp;menuID=18



1/31/22, 10:51 AM

HROnline Report Print

Department of State  
EMPLOYEE PROFILE

Report ID: EMPLOYEE PROFILE

Page No. 1  
Run Date: 01/31/2022  
Run Time: 10:49:11

Name: LENZIMARK R

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>EMP-IN-SERV-TRAIN</u>	<u>DATE</u>
CSAPETA04	A+ Essentials 2009; Using and	09/29/2011
CSAPITA03	A+ Prac Application 2009; Main	09/29/2011
SE291	High Security Alarm System In-	09/28/2011
CSAPETA05	A+ Essentials 2009; Trblsht Co	09/26/2011
CSAPETA07	A+ Essentials 2009; Oper Proc/	09/26/2011
PA198	E2 Solutions: Travel Approver	09/19/2011
PK195	Travel Preparation and Regulat	09/19/2011
PK196	E2 Solutions: Travel Arranger	09/19/2011
PK197	E2 Solutions: Traveler	09/19/2011
CSAPITA01	A+ Prac Appl 2009; Pers Comput	09/13/2011
PA448	ePerformance for Foreign Servi	09/13/2011
PN113	Introduction to Working in an	09/13/2011
CSAPETA02	A+ Essent 2009; Cnfg Displays,	09/11/2011
CSAPETA03	A+ Essent 09; Install Win Oper	09/11/2011
CSAPITA02	A+ Prac Application 2009; Trbl	09/11/2011
CSAPETA01	A+ Essent 2009; Comp Hardware	09/10/2011
PN106	Orientation - Foreign Service	09/02/2011
PA451	Ethics Orientation for New Emp	08/18/2011
PA459	Protecting Personally Identifi	08/18/2011
PT401	No FEAR Act Training	08/18/2011

WARNING: Disclose to Authorized Persons Only (22CFR 6A)  
Contains Information Protected by the Privacy Act of 1974

**PX-006**

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE





United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

MEMORANDUM

TO: DS/NOC-- Mark Lenzi

FROM: DS -- Todd Brown

SUBJECT: Length of Service Award

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Todd Brown", written over the "FROM:" line of the memorandum.

It gives me great pleasure as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security to present to you this Length of Service Award for 10 years of service to our country. It is a privilege to spend a career in public service and to act as a representative of the American people. All who successfully meet the many challenges of government service can take pride in their work and know that their accomplishments served our nation's interest.

On behalf of DS and all of your colleagues in the Department of State, please accept my congratulations on this important milestone.



## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Official recognition and appreciation  
are tendered to

*Mark R. Lenzi*

for completion of 10 years of service  
with the United States Government

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Todd J. Brown", is written over a horizontal line.

Todd J. Brown  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Bureau of Diplomatic Security  
October 2019

**PX-007**



UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



---

**MRN:** 21 STATE 114370  
**Date/DTG:** Nov 12, 2021 / 122227Z NOV 21  
**From:** SECSTATE WASHDC  
**Action:** ALL DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE  
**E.O.:** 13526  
**TAGS:** APER, AMGT  
**Pass Line:** CONSULS FOR SREP, ICAO, UNESCO, FODAG, UNEP  
**Correction Reason:** CORRECTED COPY: Change Republic of Macedonia to North Macedonia per Eatmon, Frederica P - DG  
**Subject:** 2021 Department Annual Awards: Robert C. Bannerman Diplomatic Security Employee of the Year Award

1. The Department is pleased to announce the selection of Ronald L. Roof Jr., Special Agent, DS/HTP/SP, as the recipient of the 2021 Robert C. Bannerman Award based on his initiative and leadership in directing United States Embassy Rangoon's security programs during a year that included extreme violence and a military coup all while dealing with COVID-19.
2. This prestigious award recognizes sustained superior achievement, initiative and leadership in planning, organizing, or directing a major program. This award consists of a certificate signed by the Secretary of State, and a cash award of \$10,000.00 contingent upon availability of funds.
3. The Selection Committee was chaired by Todd J. Brown, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Diplomatic Security. The other members were Carlos Matus, Acting Director DS/DSS; Cornell Chasten, Deputy Assistant Secretary DS/IP; and Stephen B. Dietz, III, Executive Director for Bureau of Diplomatic Security.
4. The Committee was impressed with Ronald's leadership, insight, and flexibility. During multiple waves of COVID in Burma he directed the closing of redundant facility access points and organized guards so as to limit their exposure to visitors and other colleagues. He developed split living and working arrangements for the assigned Marines. As fighting broke out among ethnic armed groups, and later during a full-fledged military coup, he personally organized assistance from the Burmese to evacuate non-governmental Americans working in remote areas to avoid interaction with armed groups. Ronald relied on carefully researched data, garnered from a network of contacts, in-person research, and other reliable sources to separate fact from rumor in order to support the Emergency Action Committee. Through his calm and specific delivery, Ronald not only allowed people to feel safe, but he also enlisted them in ensuring their own safety.
5. Other nominees for this award were: Erin Smart, DS/SI/PSS; Ezra Casteel, DS; Jennifer

UNCLASSIFIED

Volz, DS/CMP/TAB; Jerry Kessler, DS/SSI/PTB; Kahled Hafid, DS/IP/AF; Steven Haines, DS/MGT/CAP; Maria Bradham, DS/DC/ARDCH; Brittany Schlotzhauer, Bangkok, Thailand; Jerry Meras, DS/C/DC/WRDCD; Cote d'Ivoire; Rachel Sosin, DS/C/DC/MRDCH; Brian Hayes, DS/CMP/TSC; Derek Hugo, Montevideo, Uruguay; Elbert Calpo, Kabul, Afghanistan; Jeremy Holliman, DS/ST/STO; John Savu, Bangkok, Thailand; Lucinda Selk, Lima, Peru; Mark Lenzi, DS/C/FSE/DME; Trisha Marks, Frankfurt, Germany; Joseph Thornsberry, Bamako, Mali; Keith Evans, Bridgetown, Barbados; Matthew Moore, Jerusalem, Israel; Richard Shaw, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo; Thomas Smith, DS/SSI/NSM; Adam Lason, NSC; Charles Harrison, Karachi, Pakistan; David Howell, Bamako, Mali; Fernando Matus, Kabul, Afghanistan; Heath Ward, Skopje, North Macedonia; Leonard Danquah, Nassau, Bahamas; Paul Higgins, Mogadishu, Somalia; Peter Dinoia, Baghdad, Iraq; Robert Holbrook, Tunis, Tunisia; Robert Kelty, Sofia, Bulgaria; Ryan LaBranch, CG Cape Town, South Africa; Collin Stephens, New Delhi, India.

6. The Department takes this opportunity to emphasize the importance of the Robert C. Bannerman Award and to encourage participation in future competitions for this prestigious honor.

<b>Signature:</b>	Blinken
<hr/>	
<b>Drafted By:</b>	DS/EX/HRM:Gallian, Izumu
<b>Cleared By:</b>	M:Vass, Valerie M AF/EX:Newton, Christopher M WHA/EX:Shields, Matthew L EUR-IO/EX/HR:Shreve, Renae J EAP/EX:Benavidez, Debra A NEA-SCA/EX:Varnes, Nicole E GTM/PE:Vickers, Lisa A GTM/PE:Siekman, Kelly O GTM/OAA/AD:Babbili, Mary GTM/SCU:Peterson, Stephanie W GTM/DGTM:Juliao, Jeanne M SES\SlackA
<b>Approved By:</b>	GTM/DGTM:Lussier, Philippe A
<b>Released By:</b>	DOM HR_DGHR:Eatmon, Frederica P
<b>XMT:</b>	BASRAH, AMCONSUL; CARACAS, AMEMBASSY; CHENGDU, AMCONSUL; KABUL, AMEMBASSY; SANAA, AMEMBASSY; ST PETERSBURG, AMCONSUL; VLADIVOSTOK, AMCONSUL; YEKATERINBURG, AMCONSUL
<hr/>	
<b>Dissemination Rule:</b>	Archive Copy

UNCLASSIFIED



**PX-008**

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



---

**MRN:** 16 STATE 108752  
**Date/DTG:** Oct 03, 2016 / 031618Z OCT 16  
**From:** SECSTATE WASHDC  
**Action:** SOMALIA, USMISSION IMMEDIATE; ALL DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE  
**E.O.:** 13526  
**TAGS:** AMGT, APER  
**Pass Line:** PASS TO: INFORM CONSULS FOR SREP, ICAO, UNESCO, FODG, UNEP  
**Subject:** 2016 ROBERT C. BANNERMAN DIPLOMATIC SECURITY EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR AWARD

1. The Department is pleased to announce the selection of Jesse C. Thomas Jr., Regional Security Officer, Embassy Ouagadougou, as the winner of the 2016 Robert C. Bannerman Diplomatic Security Employee of the Year Award. This selection was based on his leadership and steadfast commitment to the safety of the Mission's community and U.S. Citizens during a volatile year of political transition in Burkina Faso which saw a coup d'État, historic elections, and a terrorist attack.

2. This award recognizes outstanding contributions in the following categories: civil service employees, couriers, security engineering officers, security officers, site security managers, and security technical specialists. The award is given to a Department of State employee who has made outstanding contributions to the Department's security programs. The award consists of a certificate signed by the Secretary of State and \$10,000.

3. The Selection Committee was chaired by Stephen B. Dietz, III, Executive Director, DS/EX. The other members were: Bill A. Miller, Director of Diplomatic Security Services; and Lisa D. Grice, Overseas Advisory Council Deputy Executive Director.

4. The committee was impressed with Mr. Thomas's heroic response to an AQIM terrorist attack on a hotel and café in Ouagadougou, killing thirty people over a period of several hours. Mr. Thomas's response to this incident helped save the lives of U.S. citizens and local nationals. As attackers walked between hotel and café, shooting Westerners and Burkinabe, Mr. Thomas who was on the scene in an armored vehicle within minutes, extracted eight U.S. citizens plus others and brought them to a safe haven where he helped stabilize a Burkinabe shot in the leg. He spent the rest of the night at the scene coordinating with security forces to identify the location and to safely extract U.S. citizens during the shooting. He maintained communication with the Front Office and Consul and coordinated the Embassy's approval of

UNCLASSIFIED

U.S. military assets to assist the Burkinabe and French Special Forces in their counter assault. After the operation concluded, he stayed to help U.S. citizen victims get follow up assistance and helped others find their Embassy or immediate medical help. He left only after there was nearly full accountability of U.S. citizens, and then he immediately switched focus to coordinate the arrival of FBI agents to assist with the investigation.

5. The Selection Committee chose James V. Dasney, Reginal Diplomatic Courier, Frankfurt, as runner-up, for his dynamic leadership which was crucial in streamlining the classified pipeline from the Department of State to U.S. missions throughout East Africa. His sustained superior achievement in supporting Mission Nairobi, strengthened interagency efforts throughout a region that is critical to our national security.

6. Other nominees for this award were: Kaustubh M. Bhawe, Addis Ababa; Christopher J. Clarkin, DS/C/FRDCD; William K. Cornett, Islamabad; Eric V. Crawford, DS/C/MRDCD; Joseph P. Desmarais, Nuevo Laredo; Peter A. Dinoia, Managua; Benjamin J. Eby, ESC Dakar; Thomas W. Eckert, Hanoi; Michael P. Fowler, DS/OPS; David S. Grogan, Bangkok; Kayla J. Hall, DS/DO/ICI; Mark S. Harris, YaoundÃ©; Michael R. Haughey, Beijing; Timothy S. Hovanec, DS/STO/SES; Christopher F. Jones, Peshawar; Mark R. Lenzi, Frankfurt; Scott P. Lewis, Baghdad; Timothy A. Longanacre, DS/ICI/CR/VPAU; Gabriel A. Macias, Recife; Steven S. May, Milan; Eric A. McKenzie, Bangkok; Jessica J. McTigue, N'Djamena; Richard J. Nelson, DS/ST/SIM; John E. Oakes Jr., Geneva; Christopher T. O'Brien, CT/SCAN; Angela M. Olson, DS/FLD/CFO/MIRO; Kevin M. O'Neil, DS/P/DP; Lawrence C. Parker, Seoul; Francesco D. Pasqualino, Doha; Christopher R. Potts, PRDCH; Scott W. Redinger, DS/ST/CMP/ECB; David C. Richardson, Canberra; Robert G. Tusing, Montevideo; Kelly L. Wheeler, DS/C/FRDCD; Jay R. Williams, Frankfurt; and Jason R. Willis, Bamako.

7. The Department takes this opportunity to emphasize the importance of the Robert C. Bannerman Diplomatic Security Employee of the Year Award and to encourage participation in future competitions for this prestigious honor.

8. Minimize considered.

**Signature:** Kerry

---

**Drafted By:** HR/PE:EHomer  
**Cleared By:** AF/EX: Eric Stromayer  
 EAP/EX: KDeBlauw  
 EUR-IO/EX: DAKins  
 NEA/SCA/EX: EAlford  
 WHA/EX: KSullivan  
 M:DWinters  
 M/PRI: SCimino  
 HR/PE:BCole  
 HR/PCPierangelo

**Approved By:** S/ES-O: AKirkpatrick  
**Released By:** WASHDC\HoltAC  
**XMT:** Director General Chacon  
IRM\_OPS\_MSO:Holt, Angela A  
SANAA, AMEMBASSY

---

**Dissemination Rule:** Archive Copy

UNCLASSIFIED

**PX-009**

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



---

**MRN:** 17 STATE 102852  
**Date/DTG:** Oct 11, 2017 / 111906Z OCT 17  
**From:** SECSTATE WASHDC  
**Action:** SOMALIA, USMISSION IMMEDIATE; ALL DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE  
**E.O.:** 13526  
**TAGS:** APER, AMGT  
**Pass Line:** CONSULS FOR SREP, ICAO, UNESCO, FODAG, UNEP  
**Subject:** 2017 ROBERT C. BANNERMAN DIPLOMATIC SECURITY EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR AWARD

1. The Department is pleased to announce the selection of Tamika D. Abbott, former Officer in Charge of the Security Engineering Service Center (ESC) for Kabul, based in Bangkok, as the winner of the 2017 Robert C. Bannerman Diplomatic Security Employee of the Year Award. This selection was based on Ms. Abbott's outstanding performance as Officer in Charge of the Security Engineering Services Center, Kabul, Afghanistan.

2. This prestigious award recognizes outstanding contributions in the following categories: civil servants, couriers, security engineering officers, security officers, site security managers, and security technical specialists. The award consists of a certificate signed by the Secretary of State and \$10,000, contingent upon availability of funds.

3. The Selection Committee was chaired by Christian J. Schurman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Programs, DS/IP. The other members were: Stephen B. Dietz, III, Executive Director, DS/EX; Wayne B. Ashbery, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Countermeasures, DS/C; and Ricardo Colon, Director of Protection, DS/DO/P.

4. The committee was impressed with Ms. Abbott's leadership and management of the Security Engineering Office throughout multiple terrorist attacks in Kabul, her work to create an aerial protection system to counter drone attacks on the Embassy compound, and her quick reaction to information technology systems hazards.

5. The Selection Committee chose Anton G. Kort, Regional Security Officer, Istanbul, as runner-up, for his efforts to ensure the safety of United States personnel and property in Istanbul despite numerous terrorist attacks and an attempted military coup.

6. Other nominees for this award were: Jeffrey E. Anders, DS/C/FRDCD; Paul P. Avallone, Athens; John W. Brandt, A/LM/PMP/DPM; Felix A. Galindo, Athens; Ralph A. Gaspard II, DS/ST/CMP; Dennis J. Goodall, Frankfurt; John C. Hicks, Kabul; Chad D. Hill, DS/STO/SES;

UNCLASSIFIED

Timothy M. Howlin, FRDCD; Scottie Jefferson, Basrah; Mark R. Lenzi, Bangkok; Patrick S. Mills, Karachi; Shane E. Morris, DS/C/DC/WRDCD; Ummi M. Myelle, DS/C/WRDCD; David B. Noble, Athens; Robbin Ryan Petersen, DS/FSE/TDB; Jason R. Pfistner, Tbilisi; Dean M. Phillip, Brazzaville; Christopher R. Potts, DS/C/DC/PRDCH; Chimere D. Ravenel, DS/STO/SES; Claire Rubino, DS/DC/FRDCD; Shawn Sherlock, DS/T/TPS; Jiro R. Waters, ARDCH; Joshua D. Weisman, DS/PII/ILD; Weylon N. Bulloch, Cairo; Jason R. Willis, Bamako.

7. The Department takes this opportunity to emphasize the importance of the Robert C. Bannerman Diplomatic Security Employee of the Year Award and to encourage participation in future competitions for this prestigious honor.

8. Minimize considered.

**Signature:** Tillerson

---

**Drafted By:** HR/PE:Spinner, Mikayla

**Cleared By:** M.Fields, Jacqueline  
AF/EX:Dille, Benjamin B  
WHA/EX:Pan, Angela P  
EAP/EX:Verloop, Marja D  
EUR-IO/EX/PMO:Watson, John K  
NEA-SCA/EX:Inzerillo, Suzanne M  
HR/PE:Siekman, Kelly O  
HR/PE:Scandola, Joni  
SES\WellsAS

**Approved By:** HR:Todd, William E (Ambassador)

**Released By:** HR\_DGHR:Eatmon, Frederica P - DG

**XMT:** SANAA, AMEMBASSY

---

**Dissemination Rule:** Archive Copy

UNCLASSIFIED

**PX-010**



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mark Lenzi, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) Case No.  
v. ) 1:21-cv-01371 PTG IDD  
)  
United States Department of )  
State, and Antony J. Blinken, )  
United States Secretary of )  
State, )  
)  
Defendants.)

-----X

\* \* \* \* \*

CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION  
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KELLY SIEKMAN  
Wednesday, January 11, 2023, 9:44 a.m. EDT  
Washington, D.C.

MAGNA LEGAL SERVICES  
(866) 624-6221  
www.MagnaLS.com

1

2     The Videotaped deposition of KELLY SIEKMAN, was held  
3     at STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP, 1330 Connecticut Avenue,  
4     Northwest, Washington, D.C., commencing January 11,  
5     2023 at 9:44 a.m., on the above date, before JEANINN  
6     ALEXIS, a Stenographer and Notary Public in and for  
7                     the District of Columbia.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 APPEARANCES:

2 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS:

3 CHRISTOPHER A. SUAREZ, ESQUIRE

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

4 1330 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, D.C. 20036

5 202.429.8131

sreed@steptoe.com

6

7 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:

8 CATHERINE YANG, ESQUIRE

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

9 2100 Jamieson Avenue

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

10 703.299.3741

matthew.mezger@usdoj.gov

11

12

13 ALSO PRESENT:

14 Joe Weltz, VIDEOGRAPHER

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

I N D E X		
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KELLY SIEKMAN		
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11TH, 2023		
EXAMINATION BY:		PAGE
MR. SUAREZ		7
MS. YANG		278
EXHIBITS:	DESCRIPTION:	PAGE
Exhibit 1	LinkedIn Profile	26
Exhibit 2	Defendant's Disclosure	27
Exhibit 3	DS-5055 Form Change FAQ	121
Exhibit 4	Defendant's Supplemental Disclosure	161
Exhibit 5	Defendant's Supplemental Disclosure	166
Exhibit 6	Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report	170
Exhibit 7	U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report 5/14/2018	173
Exhibit 8	U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report 4/9/2019	198
Exhibit 9	U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report 5/14/20	206
Exhibit 10	U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report 4/22/2021	215
Exhibit 11	U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation Report 3/3/2022	235

1	Report 5/15/2022	
2	Exhibit 13 Decision Criteria for Tenure and Promotion	252
	in the Foreign Service	
3		
	Exhibit 14 Procedural Precepts for the 2022 Foreign	253
4	Service Selection Boards Table of Contents	
5	Exhibit 15 U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation	259
	Report 5/2/2012	
6		
	Exhibit 16 U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation	261
7	Report 4/23/2013	
8	Exhibit 17 U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation	266
	Report 5/8/2015	
9		
	Exhibit 18 U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation	271
10	Report 5/2/2016	
11	Exhibit 19 U.S. Foreign Service Employee Evaluation	273
	Report 4/25/2017	
12		
13	(Exhibits attached hereto.)	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (9:44 a.m.)

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the record.  
4 This begins Videotape No. 1 in the deposition of Kelly  
5 Siekman in the matter of Mark Lenzi versus the United  
6 States Department of State, and Antony J. Blinken, in  
7 the United States District Court, Eastern District of  
8 Virginia.

9 Today's date is January 11th, 2023. The  
10 time on the monitor is 9:44. This deposition is being  
11 taken at Steptoe & Johnson, LLP, 1330 Connecticut  
12 Avenue, Northwest, at the request of Steptoe and  
13 Johnson, LLP.

14 The videographer is Joe Weltz of Magna Legal  
15 Services, and the court reporter is Jeaninn Alexis of  
16 Magna Legal Services.

17 Will counsel and all parties present state  
18 their appearances and who they represent.

19 MR. SUAREZ: Good morning. This is  
20 Christopher Suarez from Steptoe & Johnson on behalf of  
21 plaintiff, Mark Lenzi. With me is Elizabeth Goodwin  
22 also from Steptoe & Johnson.

1 MS. YANG: Catherine Yang from DOJ on behalf  
2 of the witness.

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Will the court reporter  
4 please swear in the witness.  
5 Whereupon,

6 KELLY SIEKMAN,  
7 the deponent herein, called for oral examination in  
8 the matter pending, being first duly sworn to tell the  
9 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,  
10 testifies as follows:

11 EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. SUAREZ:

13 Q Good morning.

14 A Good morning.

15 Q Could you state your name for the record,  
16 please?

17 A Yes. My name is Kelly Siekman.

18 Q I wanted to make sure I said it correctly.  
19 I thought it was Siekman, but I just wanted to make  
20 sure.

21 A It's okay. I answer to either.

22 Q Okay. Good. Well, I will -- I will refer

1 MS. YANG: Objection.

2 THE DEPONENT: There's no stated rule to  
3 that effect.

4 BY MR. SUAREZ:

5 Q Okay. And you would agree in this one, the  
6 rater provided an assessment he was satisfactory or  
7 better; correct?

8 A Yes, the rater did do that.

9 Q So the reference is to tone and contents of  
10 communications in the development of the rater didn't  
11 deem that sufficient to rate the employee  
12 unsatisfactory; correct?

13 MS. YANG: Objection.

14 THE DEPONENT: As the rater indicated, the  
15 overall performance was satisfactory or better, I  
16 would say no.

17 (Siekman Deposition Exhibit 8 marked for  
18 identification.)

19 BY MR. SUAREZ:

20 Q Okay. I'm going to give you Exhibit 8. Is  
21 it eight?

22 Okay. For the record, Exhibit 8 is Bates



1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

3

4 I, Jeaninn Y. Alexis, a Notary Public of the  
5 District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the  
6 with-named witness personally appeared before me at  
7 the time and place herein set out, and after having  
8 been duly sworn by me, according to law, was examined  
9 by counsel.

10 I further certify that the examination was recorded  
11 stenographically by me, and that this transcript is a true  
12 record of the proceedings.

13 I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of  
14 the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of  
15 the parties nor in any way interested in the outcome of the  
16 action.

17 THE REPORTER: As witness my hand and seal  
18 this 18th day of January, 2023.

19

20

  
JEANINN ALEXIS

21

My Commission Expires: 11/30/2023

22


**PX-011**

**(Withheld from Public Docket)**

**PX-012**

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

- - - - - x  
:  
MARK LENZI, :  
:  
:  
Plaintiff, :  
:  
:  
v. : Civil Action No.  
: 1:21-CV-1371 (PTG/IDD)  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE, et al., :  
:  
:  
Defendants. :  
- - - - - x



Alexandria, VA

Monday, December 12, 2022

**Contains Confidential Information Subject to Protective Order**

Deposition of:

MARK LENZI

a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the Defendant in  
the above-entitled action, before Kevin Carr, Notary Public  
in and for the District of Columbia, in the Office of the  
United States Attorney, 2100 Jamieson Avenue, commencing  
at 9:00 a.m.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

(202) 467-9200

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Plaintiff:

CHRISTOPHER A. SUAREZ, ESQ.

STEVEN KAPLAN, ESQ.

SHANNON REID, ESQ.

Steptoe & Johnson LLP

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 429-8131

CSuarez@steptoe.com

On Behalf of the Defendant:

MATTHEW J. MEZGER, ESQ.

LAUREN WETZLER, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorneys

Office of the United States Attorney

2100 Jamieson Avenue

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

(703) 299-3741

matthew.mezger@usdoj.gov

CATHERINE YANG, ESQ.

Trial Attorney

United States Department of Justice Civil Division

1100 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 514-4336/1944

Catherine.M.Yang@usdoj.gov

EMMA BROCHES

Attorney Advisor

U.S. Department of State

C O N T E N T S

WITNESS	PAGE
Mark Lenzi	4
DEPOSITION EXHIBITS:	
1 - E-mail from Evanoff to Crone dated 9/20/18	38
2 - E-mail from McKay to Lenzi / Approval of Reasonable Accommodations	49
3 - E-mail from Crone to Lingenfelter dated 10/30/18	59
4 - E-mail from Lingenfelter to Lenzi dated 4/8/19	71
5 - E-mail from Lenzi to Karl Field dated 9/13/19	75
6 - E-mail from Lenzi to Karl Field dated 9/13/19	82
7 - E-mail from Lenzi to Yamate dated 10/17/19	93
8 - E-mail from Lenzi to Yelland dated 11/5/20	132
9 - E-mail from Lenzi to Lebron dated 11/17/20	140
10 - Letter from Ross Zafonte dated 11/18/20	145
11 - E-mail from Lenzi to Eatmon dated 11/23/20	159
12 - E-mail from Lenzi to Eatmon dated 2/18/21	179
13 - E-mail from Lenzi to Kevin Kocher date 12/10/19	208
14 - E-mail from Lenzi to Kent Ratzlaff dated 1/24/18	214
15 - E-mail from Lenzi to J Vincent Dasney dated 4/25/18	219
16 - E-mail from Lenzi to Rahim Theriot dated 5/1/18	228
17 - E-mail from Raymond Rivera to Lenzi dated 3/21/19	230
18 - E-mail from Brown to Lenzi dated 5/28/21	272
19 - E-mail from Rivera to Watson dated 4/15/21	316

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. MEZGER: You can swear the witness, please.

3 COURT REPORTER: Good morning. Please raise your  
4 right hand, sir.

5 Whereupon,

6 MARK LENZI

7 was called as a witness and, having been first duly sworn,  
8 was examined and testified as follows:

9 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

10 BY MR. MEZGER:

11 Q Good morning, Mr. Lenzi. I know we just met a  
12 moment ago but for the record now, my name is Matthew  
13 Mezger, and I am joined today by Lauren Wetzler. And also  
14 here from the Department of State is Emma Broches. We  
15 represent the Defendant in this action.

16 Can you please state and spell your name for the  
17 record?

18 A Sure. It's Mark Lenzi, L-e-n-z-i.

19 Q I am just going to go through the general  
20 instructions for today's deposition. The court reporter is  
21 transcribing down your testimony today. Therefore, to  
22 preserve a clear record of testimony, it's important for us  
23 to following -- to follow the following ground rules: Do  
24 you understand that you have just taken an oath to tell the  
25 truth and it is the same oath that you would take if you

1 work in DME until I go to Belgrade.

2 MR. MEZGER: Do you recall that on or around  
3 October 22, 2020, Andrew Kaleczyc you Monterey was a NOW  
4 position on which you could bid?

5 THE WITNESS: I --

6 MR. SUAREZ: Objection, to form.

7 THE WITNESS: I remember that he -- I remember  
8 being -- it was very striking how he -- in conversations I  
9 had with him both on the phone and then e-mail about him  
10 being very enthusiastic about my bid list. And saying he  
11 was very enthusiastic about it. Oh, yes, and Belgrade  
12 that's a perfect place for your, you know, language  
13 positions, everything else, language skills.

14 Okay. And then only a few days after saying that,  
15 then he said oh, well, yeah. What about Monterey? How  
16 would you feel about going to Monterey? And I said to him,  
17 oh, they have already -- they meaning the security  
18 technology division. They have already asked me about that  
19 because I had a phone call with -- Jack Lutz is his name.

20 At the time, he was the officer in charge, OIC in  
21 Mexico City of our office, of our engineering services  
22 center, Mexico City. This was approximately June of 2020,  
23 when I had that phone call with him.

24 And he brought up Monterey with me. And said  
25 would you be interested? Monterey is under me. I am in



1 Mexico City. Would you be interested in going to Monterey?

2 And I said I actually know a lot about Monterey.

3 Because Phil Blanton, my previous boss, SEO

4 Phillip Blanton was my previous boss before, Brian Hayes in

5 Guangzhou. Said that that place is really tough medically.

6 You are out in the -- kind of by yourself. You don't even  
7 have a technician working for you. You are basically a  
8 glorified technician. It's a lot of being on ladders, by  
9 yourself, trying to snake through Cat-5 cable, and things  
10 like this.

11 And then he said there is also a lot of driving.

12 This is in approximately 2016 when he told me this when we  
13 were both in Guangzhou. He said there is a lot of driving  
14 in between posts between Monterey and its constituent posts,  
15 other smaller U.S. consults. And he said you are driving  
16 from, you know, five hours in the desert at night by  
17 yourself. And he said like it's not the type of place you  
18 want to send a young SEO to.

19 So I had remembered what Phil told me about

20 Monterey. So and Jack Lutz called me about Monterey to

21 quote, unquote, you know, "Feel you out on it. What do you  
22 think about that," I said appreciate you calling me about it  
23 because I do want to go overseas. But I said I know about  
24 Monterey because Blanton, SEO Blanton told me. Has told me  
25 all about it. Everything I know about Monterey is I won't

1 be able to do that with my medical situation.

2 And he said well, for example? And I said well, I  
3 remember Blanton told me that I am going to be on -- that I  
4 would be on the OIC like he was. He was on ladders a lot  
5 there. I said if you are by yourself on ladders, I said,  
6 for instance, my vestibular therapy, I was like that's not  
7 conducive to Monterey.

8 And he said thank you for that example. He said  
9 That's what I thought anyways. I know about your situation.

10 I want to wish you the best because I have been following  
11 you, and I will relay what you said. I support you in that.  
12 I don't blame you.

13 He said I will relay that to -- he didn't say, but  
14 I got the impression that it was Ronald Stuart that you  
15 relayed that to that I said I couldn't go there. And he  
16 thanked me for the call. Again, this is approximately June  
17 of 2020. He thanked me for the call.

18 And then -- so to answer your question, when  
19 Kaleczyc brought up in Monterey in September or October of  
20 2020, I said well, I have already talked with Jack Lutz  
21 about that. Like no, I can't go to Monterey.

22 MR. MEZGER: Jack Lutz and Phil Blanton, are the  
23 employees of MED?

24 THE WITNESS: No. They are security engineering  
25 office.

1 am -- yes. I am enthusiastic about your bid list,  
2 especially meaning Belgrade being at the top of that bell --  
3 of that bid list.

4 Q Okay.

5 A So my wife and I were very happy to receive that  
6 e-mail from him.

7 Q Okay. So is it a call or an e-mail or both?

8 A It was both.

9 Q Okay.

10 A At that time, I think Kaleczyc knew that probably  
11 in the handover -- I don't know. But in the handover that  
12 he had from Lingenfelter, Lingenfelter probably said -- I  
13 imagine that hey -- the Frankfurt situation probably briefed  
14 him on that. So Kaleczyc seemed kind of very aware of that.

15 Well, we want to -- let's get out in the front. Let's have  
16 good communication. Let's talk both by Microsoft Teams. I  
17 think he might even talked to cell phone and e-mail as well.

18 And I appreciated that because I thought talking  
19 to Andy at the time that he recognized that kind of  
20 Frankfurt was a fiasco. And he didn't want to repeat that.

21 So my wife and I, yes, we are very happy when he sent that  
22 e-mail saying what he was saying, and orally. But having  
23 that in writing, saying he is enthusiastic about my bid  
24 list.

25 MR. MEZGER: So his e-mail confirmation, is -- was

1 it an effective memorialization of your phone call in your  
2 opinion?

3 MR. SUAREZ: Objection, to form.

4 THE WITNESS: No. It wasn't a memorial. It just  
5 confirmed. What I was happy about is a lot of times in the  
6 State Department things are said orally. Like what happened  
7 with -- I am scarred. I -- the experience that I had with  
8 Assistant Secretary Evanoff where he said we are going to  
9 try to do everything in our power to get you a Y-Tour to  
10 Portsmouth, and then not have that happen.

11 And more than that, basically have Michelle Crone  
12 and others say to me, no, he said there was never a  
13 conversation about that. That's honestly, typically what  
14 happens at State Department. Things are said orally,  
15 promises are made and then, of course, there is oh, I never  
16 said that.

17 So, yes, I was happy that Andy, at least confirmed  
18 that. Because that was something in writing that it wasn't  
19 just he couldn't deny later, right? So my wife -- that's  
20 why I keep saying my wife. My wife was on that MS Teams  
21 call, that initial one with him, and she heard that too.

22 So we were both happy to have something in writing  
23 where the typical kind of -- our experience would be that  
24 oh, Andy just denied it. So oh, he was never enthusiastic  
25 about the bid list. So yes, we were happy to see that in

1 writing.

2 BY MR. MEZGER:

3 Q And around October of 2020, Andrew Kaleczyc sent  
4 you a list of domestic NOW positions, but also pointed out  
5 that Monterey was the only overseas NOW position, correct?

6 A I believe so. Yes.

7 Q Okay. And Andrew Kaleczyc told you that if DRAD  
8 determines that no accommodation can be made for Monterrey,  
9 that DS would be willing to consider you for other overseas  
10 assignments. Does that sound correct?

11 A It sounds -- yes. It sounds familiar. Because I  
12 remember thinking, whoa, wait a minute. Something happened  
13 here in the last couple of days that I don't know about.  
14 But his tone, everything about -- something had happened  
15 with him or somebody had said something to him.

16 Because his tone was markedly different. It was  
17 more -- how to say -- very formal. And I think he even went  
18 to calling me like Mr. Lenzi, instead of Mark, and stuff  
19 like that or whatever, that sort of thing. So yeah, that  
20 was striking for me. But yes, I believe so.

21 Q Did you ever write to DRAD asking for  
22 accommodations in Monterey?

23 A I did not.

24 Q No one from DRAD ever told you that the Monterey  
25 assignment could not -- strike that. No one from DRAD ever

1 and it will just be -- it's a waste of everyone's time. He  
2 said I strongly advise you to go to Baku. You'll get the  
3 language bonus there. Think of it as Kyiv light. I know  
4 you want to go to Kyiv and really do that.

5 But he is like I don't want to by you doing the  
6 shoot-out in Kyiv, I don't want you to undermine the fact  
7 that you could go to Baku. You have been to Baku before.  
8 You have Baku wired. You are -- you have got a lot of  
9 context there. You are going to do great in Baku. Just do  
10 it.

11 And so then I had this debate with my wife at the  
12 time whether I was going to shoot out Kyiv or not. I can't  
13 tell you. I can't say for certainty whether I did shoot-out  
14 Kyiv or not. I don't think I ended up doing it, but I -- so  
15 all that to say is I think it was a total of three times  
16 always for Kyiv prior to injury that I shot out.

17 Q Just those three were the only shoot-outs in  
18 your -- pre-Belgrade in your tenure?

19 A Pre --

20 Q That was the point of my question. Let me  
21 withdraw it, and I will ask you this. So apart from those  
22 three shoot-outs and your debate about the potential  
23 fourth --

24 A Yes.

25 Q -- shoot-out, were those the only shoot-outs that

1     **you had in your State Department career prior to the**  
2     **Belgrade shoot-out?**

3           A     I believe so.

4           Q     **Okay.**

5           A     And that's why I -- because Frankfurt, which we  
6     have already discussed, that Frankfurt 2020 position, I  
7     maintained then, and I still maintain now, that they -- that  
8     DS made those -- designated those entry-level. Because they  
9     knew I had a history. They knew I knew the system how to do  
10    a shoot-out. So that was a big reasoning factor for them.  
11    They knew that I -- they knew very well that I knew how to  
12    do a shoot-out. Knew what to do as far as contact people,  
13    and get letters of reference and all this other stuff. And  
14    that I would do it.

15                So I would have shot out Kyiv if afforded the  
16    opportunity if it wasn't designated entry-level. But yes, I  
17    believe -- I could be wrong, but I believe those Kyiv shoot-  
18    outs were my only ones prior to Belgrade. Yes.

19           Q     **Okay. Back to the more specific to the Belgrade**  
20    **position here. Do you know who the Department of State's --**  
21    **or diplomatic securities, rather, preferred candidate was**  
22    **for the Belgrade position?**

23           A     After -- I didn't at the time. After I initiated  
24    an EEO complaint for the Belgrade position, then I think  
25    through discovery, yes. I was made aware of who that was.

1 foundation.

2 THE WITNESS: Without knowing who it was, I can't  
3 speak to that. But I will say because it's Poland and  
4 because that's where I did my Peace Corps., and because  
5 that's where I have a U.S. Government rating in the Polish  
6 language of advanced/high, and because that Warsaw  
7 position -- excuse me -- it's listed as language-preferred,  
8 I find it highly unlikely that there would be another SEO  
9 that would be more qualified than me to go to Warsaw.

10 I can't say that with absolute certainty, of  
11 course. Maybe there is somebody. I mean SEO -- again,  
12 there is only about 198 of the skill code. I am 99.99  
13 percent sure I would know if there was another Polish  
14 speaker in our cadre and somebody that was as into the,  
15 let's say, everything about Poland as I am, but I can't say  
16 with 100 percent certainty.

17 But I can say -- I can state with a large degree  
18 of certainty that I would be the most qualified SEO  
19 candidate of any SEO for Warsaw.

20 BY MR. MEZGER:

21 Q Is that your position even if the other bidder was  
22 at the grade of the post, FPO 2?

23 A It is actually.

24 Q Okay.

25 A Because granted, I was a 3, and that was a stretch



1 position. But keep in mind, I had already received a  
2 handshake when I was in Guangzhou and accepted that  
3 handshake for Baku which was a stretch position, right? So  
4 I knew that there wasn't some magic thing. They already  
5 knew my management skills and everything else. I could  
6 handle a B officer in charge of an office.

7           They knew based on who I was working with in  
8 Frankfurt and stuff like that, that I could do it. So no,  
9 it wasn't -- the 3 and 2 designation at those points, it's  
10 really just a -- it's kind of a formality, but for things  
11 like shoot-outs.

12           Now, I knew -- I was very aware of if they gave  
13 that a handshake to that officer, regardless of whether you  
14 knew Polish or language-preferred thing and everything else.

15       But if that officer was a 2, and I am a 3, and I do a  
16 shoot-out for that, I was cognizant of the fact that my  
17 likelihood of success of that shoot-out, given the fact that  
18 I have done all these shoot-outs at-grade before, and I  
19 still lost them, I was very aware that I likely wouldn't win  
20 a shoot-out for Warsaw.

21           **Q     Was there a language preference for this post?**

22           A     I believe so. Yeah. Polish with 0/0 in -- listed  
23 next to it in the FSBid. Yes.

24           **Q     Okay. Is it your belief that language is a**  
25 **determining factor for assignment shoot-out challenges?**

1           A       Not a determining factor, but it is what exactly  
2   it says in the regs. If you look up in the State Department  
3   regs in the Foreign Affairs Manual or the Foreign Affairs  
4   Handbook, quote, unquote, "language-preferred," it's that.  
5   It's exactly that. They don't put that 0/0 for Polish for  
6   the fun of it, right? They have sat down.

7                   The State Department, HR, and DS HR have sat down  
8   and said, okay, well, these positions are were language-  
9   preferred because of all these reasons that they come up  
10   with HR. So they -- a lot of serious thought goes into  
11   that. So yes, that's a big consideration. They wouldn't  
12   list that if -- for nothing, right? So yeah.

13           **Q       For this post, and for others, you said 0/0,**  
14   **right? Does that just mean proficiency in the language?**

15           A       Yes. That means -- well, yes, it does. It means  
16   proficiency. Ideally, it means if you go in -- let's say  
17   with Serbo-Croatian, for instance. Like that's not a  
18   language that I speak at a -- like a -- what we call it 3/3  
19   level like my like Russian or Polish is at. But it's a  
20   language that I could go in there and muck through  
21   conversation and get a 1/1.

22                   So 0/0 is something where you can -- you go in.  
23   You are -- you have the guts enough because it's kind of  
24   embarrassing, but officers do this all the time so they can  
25   get that language preferred. They go in and say, I am going

1 MR. MEZGER: Okay. And you were told that because  
2 this was an excursion tour outside your specialty, you would  
3 need to complete training before you got to post, correct?

4 MR. SUAREZ: Objection, to form.

5 THE WITNESS: No. That's actually incorrect in  
6 the sense that I -- when I interviewed for the position, I  
7 had multiple interviews for the position in Frankfurt with  
8 personnel, IRM personnel in Frankfurt. And they told me,  
9 along with other IMTS management -- specifically, there is a  
10 guy. There is an -- he is not an officer. He is a  
11 specialist named Barry Gray, who's a 2 level IMTS.

12 And he is -- which is -- for IMTS is very senior.  
13 Like they have a much different kind of promotion scale  
14 than SEOs. And Barry Gray is somebody that I know and as a  
15 family friend from my days in Frankfurt. Our children kind  
16 of grew up together and still play -- still, you know, game  
17 online and stuff like this.

18 And Barry Gray told me that as an IMTS, he said  
19 you would be great at it. You should apply for it. And he  
20 said expect to A, get the handshake. B, go there right away  
21 because he said we, meaning the IMTS, skill code, are --  
22 have been -- we have been sending out IMTSs without  
23 training.

24 And so that was music to my ears because I wasn't  
25 going to even bid on the position if a four-month, you know,

1 training was going to be part of the deal. The whole -- the  
2 alluring thing for me is that Barry said they wanted people  
3 right away, that I would be like the only person applying.  
4 Specifically for me in this IMTS -- the specific -- there is  
5 a lot of IMTS positions available.

6 But this IMT -- this particular IMTS position was  
7 because of my experience, my technical experience with  
8 Avaya, A-v-i-y-a telephones, and Nortel telephones, and also  
9 Cisco, C-i-s-c-o phones. Specifically, I did a lot of  
10 technical counterintelligence things with those three type  
11 of phones that gave me a lot of experience with let's see  
12 the digital networking aspect and security aspect of those  
13 phones.

14 So Barry said apply for this specific IMTS.  
15 Because IMTSs could also be radio techs, radio frequency  
16 techs where you are installing antennas on the top of  
17 embassies and consulates, something like this. But he said  
18 you would be perfect for, and I know we are desperately --  
19 we desperately need these telephone techs. Specifically, I  
20 think he said for Avaya phones.

21 So yeah, I bid on it. And when I bid on it, then  
22 I think I got an e-mail from David Mango and maybe some  
23 other person and another person or two in Frankfurt. And I  
24 had a series of interviews with who would be my supervisors  
25 there, interviewing me to judge my qualifications for my

1 candidacy, for my bid for the IMTS Frankfurt 2021 position.

2 And those -- in those interviews, it confirmed,  
3 they confirmed what Barry Gray, IMTS Barry Gray, said to me.

4 That no, we really were happy with your experience. It's  
5 perfect, especially with Avaya phones. We need somebody I  
6 think yesterday was almost like the direct quote. It was,  
7 you know, we need somebody very fast. No. You will not  
8 need the training. Barry was right about that. And they  
9 were very good interviews.

10 So no, to answer your question. It was  
11 represented to me with IRM personnel multiple times that I  
12 would not be -- need the IMTS training.

13 MR. MEZGER: Okay. So it's your testimony that  
14 you were never told at any time that you needed to complete  
15 the training before you go to post. That's your testimony?

16 MR. SUAREZ: Objection, to form. Go ahead.

17 THE WITNESS: It is not my testimony.

18 MR. MEZGER: Okay.

19 THE WITNESS: My testimony was in my interviews  
20 and everything, discussions with IRM personnel that had  
21 they, at any time, told me that I would need the training --  
22 I specifically asked about this. Because it was a deal  
23 breaker for me. I am on a, you know, DRAD, yes. That was a  
24 prime concern to me that look, no training for this.

25 I have got -- already got the stuff, the

1 experience that you want in these Avaya telephones. I can  
2 go out tomorrow and install these, and network these in  
3 certain embassies. And had, at any time, whether it be  
4 Barry Gray -- if Barry Gray had told me initially that there  
5 was a training requirement, I would not have bid on the  
6 position.

7 But the fact of the matter is he said there wasn't  
8 so, therefore, I did bid on the position. And when I bid on  
9 the position, it was in interviews represented to me then  
10 that there was no training requirement.

11 Subsequent to that, after I received a handshake,  
12 which is a big deal in the State Department. To get a  
13 handshake for a position, it means you are 99.999 percent  
14 there. You are going. Only after I received that  
15 handshake, did I get something from -- did I get a  
16 communication, an e-mail, from Andy Kaleczyc, my CDO, that  
17 said oh, I see you got a handshake for that.

18 Congratulations. And if you want to talk about sarcasm, I  
19 believe that congratulations was fellow sarcasm there.

20 But regardless of whether it was or not, he said  
21 congratulations. Let me check into -- there might be a  
22 training requirement. And let me look into that. And I  
23 said to him in an e-mail correspondence back, oh, I have  
24 already discussed this training. No. There is no training  
25 requirement. They are waiving it because they want me there

1 the State Department all the time, where it's, heaven  
2 forbid, it probably does not occur in the U.S. Attorney's  
3 Office. But in the State Department it occurs all the time,  
4 when you call it -- when you slow-walk something or when you  
5 say, oh, yeah, I will do that. But when you say, yeah, I  
6 will advocate for that, when you -- everything else.

7 It's so you can say you are advocating but what  
8 you are doing in practice is actually undermining or slow-  
9 walking or otherwise undermining what you are saying.

10 And that's a classic example of what in State  
11 Department Andy said to me, oh, let me see. Let me get  
12 involved here, and I think I can advocate for you and let me  
13 look into getting that training waived, and I will see. And  
14 I -- my firm belief is that he did not advocate. He  
15 undermined.

16 Because how else to explain with other SEOs that  
17 were in my class, SEO Richard Hall, for instance, was a  
18 2550. And then goes to be an IMTS without having that State  
19 Department training. There is people that I know that did  
20 that. Barry Gray, again, that 2 level IMTS told, quote,  
21 unquote, "We are doing it all the time now, especially  
22 because of COVID. We're sending out IMTSs without that  
23 training."

24 So by information and believe everything that I  
25 have seen firsthand, you know I knew that this was not only

1           Because normally, they don't have -- normally,  
2   they just have -- a class is just comprised of all new  
3   people going into the Foreign Service. So they were very  
4   happy the instructors were that I gave this presentation.  
5   That was like day two.

6           Then day three, was like hardcore PowerShell  
7   that -- where you had to follow along, no breaks or very  
8   minimal breaks. Follow along in like Linux systems and just  
9   hardcore computer PowerShell and programming. And that, I  
10   found, not only -- as I knew I would, and especially without  
11   a reasonable accommodation for that, I found that exhausting  
12   and headache-inducing.

13           BY MR. MEZGER:

14           Q     Got it. So you had told the training personnel  
15   that there was 100 percent attendance policy for good reason  
16   with this course. Is that correct?

17           A     Yes.

18           Q     And you could -- you informed the training  
19   personnel that you saw that the pace of the course is so  
20   quick and intense. Is that right?

21           A     I don't know. But yes. I think that's to Steven  
22   like Ryde or R-y-d-e or something. Yes. Yes.

23           Q     And you would agree you didn't complete the  
24   training, correct?

25           A     I would agree that I don't even know if I



1 completed the first week of -- I might have completed the  
2 first week of the training.

3 Q Okay.

4 A But yes. I did not complete the training.

5 Q And you -- as part of your reason for withdrawal,  
6 you cited your medical appointments in Philadelphia and  
7 Boston. Is that right?

8 A I think I might have cited my headaches for that.  
9 But yes, I probably said upcoming medical appointments too.

10 Q Appointments that were in Boston and Philadelphia?

11 A Correct. At UPenn and at Mass General Hospital.

12 Q Physically in Philadelphia?

13 A Yep. Going to UPenn.

14 Q Physically in Boston?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And at this time, you had a Class 2 medical  
17 clearance, right?

18 A This is?

19 Q This is 2021. And I am sorry for my interruption.

20 A Yes. Because I think I received my Class 2 for  
21 Frankfurt. You know I can't say for sure if I had a  
22 Class -- I had Class 2 for Belgrade. I had a Class 2 for  
23 Warsaw. I don't know if I actually had a Class 2, at that  
24 time, for Frankfurt. But I had Class 2, at least, for  
25 others and possibly Frankfurt at that time. Yes.



# PX-013

See Instructions Before Completing

U.S. Department of State



# U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

For employees at Class FS-03 and below and all career candidates regardless of grade

## SUBMISSION CONTROL

DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-02-2012	DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-07-2013	DATE RELEASED TO DEPARTMENT FILES (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-08-2013
---	---	--

NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI)

LENZI, MARK R.

TYPE OF REPORT

REGULAR ☐CAREER CANDIDATE ☒VOLUNTARY ☐INTERIM: Change of Rater ☐Duties ☐Assignment ☐

GRADE

FS - 06

SSN

XXX-XX-4434

POSITION TITLE

SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING

POST OR ORGANIZATION

175233 - DS/CMP/ECB

PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy)

From 10-03-2011

To

04-15-2012

RATER: JOHNSTONE, GREGG M.

GRADE: FS - 02

TITLE: SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER

REVIEWER: THERIOT, RAHIM

GRADE: FS - 02

TITLE: SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING

After careful review, I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.

A. /s/ GREGG JOHNSTONE

Rater's signature upon completion of Sections I, III, IV, and V

05-02-2012

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

B. /s/ RAHIM THERIOT

Reviewer's signature upon completion of Section VI

05-02-2012

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## I. CERTIFICATION - WORK REQUIREMENTS AND COUNSELING

Work requirements were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy)

10-08-2011

If applicable, requirements were revised on (mm-dd-yyyy)

Rater and rated employee held counseling sessions to discuss performance on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)

1. 11-16-2011

2. 03-27-2012

3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

In the case of an unsatisfactory performance rating, this is also to certify that the requirements of 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 (tenured employees), 3 FAH-1 H-2326 (employees subject to administrative promotion), or 3 FAM 2248 (FSO Career Candidates) have been met.

I certify that counseling sessions took place during the rating period and that at least one of them was documented in writing using the Counseling Certification Form (DS-1974).

/s/ GREGG JOHNSTONE

Rating Officer

/s/ MARK LENZI

Rated Employee

04-30-2012

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## II. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)

A. **Examples of Performance:** Specific examples have been provided in all sections ☒ Yes (If not, return for rewrite)B. **Certification:** This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material.

05-02-2012

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

MICHAEL E. BISHOP

Panel Chairperson's Name - Type

/s/ MICHAEL BISHOP

Signature

C. **Comments:** (If submitted late, indicate who is responsible for delay.)

**III. EMPLOYEE'S POSITION AND WORK REQUIREMENTS (Established by Rater, Reviewer and Employee)**

A. Describe the position and where it fits in the staffing pattern; indicate the number and kind of employees supervised or team affiliation(s) and tasking(s), whichever is applicable.

Mark Lenzi is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the Emanations Countermeasures Branch (ECB), which is a part of the Countermeasures Program Division. The branch provides technical and policy countermeasure support to overseas Engineering Service Centers and Engineering Service Offices. Mark is responsible for providing engineering services to the Certified Tempest Technical Authority section, an activity in ECB. He will occasionally direct other SEOs and/or contractors on assigned projects.

B. Divide work requirements into two categories: continuing responsibilities and specific objectives (including, as appropriate, professional development activities), listing these in descending priority order.

**Continuing Responsibilities:**

1. Provide engineering services to the Certified Tempest Technical Authority section.
2. Conduct TEMPTTEST Countermeasure reviews as directed by the CTTA.
3. Prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams, in a timely manner, on product evaluations, identified vulnerabilities, countermeasures, and other technical matters as required.
4. Apply internal control measures to protect organizational integrity and prevent unauthorized disclosure of classified and sensitive materials, report security incidents to the appropriate management officials, and properly safeguard all classified and sensitive materials and equipment in assigned areas.
5. Ensure that all physical, material, and human resources are safeguarded against waste, fraud, and unauthorized use or misappropriation, obligations incurred comply with applicable laws and regulations, and revenues and expenditures pertaining to the incumbent's operation are promptly recorded and accounted for in accordance with DoS procedures.
6. Uphold the principles of Equal Employment Opportunity.
7. Direct other SEOs and contractors on assigned projects.

**Specific Objectives:**

1. Review and become familiar with the DS security standards and policies in the 12 FAH 6 and 12 FAH 5 as applicable to the execution of Security Engineering Officer.
2. Learn about the other branches and section within the Countermeasures Program.
3. Participate in an Overseas TDY.
4. Assist the CMP Special projects coordinator with duties and task.

C. Describe any special circumstances influencing the work program.

**IV. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rater)**

For employees at Class FS-03 and below and all career candidates regardless of grade

**A. General Appraisal:**

All Employees: Performance was satisfactory or better (If no, see instructions for documenting unsatisfactory performance)

YES



NO



**B. Discussion:**

Identify at least three of the work requirements including continuing responsibilities and/or specific objectives listed in Section III.

For each, using examples, describe the employee's performance and accomplishments.

Mark Lenzi has demonstrated that he is capable of a very successful career as a Security Engineering Officer. This reviewing officer strongly recommends that Mr. Lenzi be tenured and promoted at the earliest opportunity. He has made a large contribution to the Emanations Countermeasures Branch through a combination of his prior engineering experiences and his pro-active and flexible approach to challenging engineering and policy issues.

Provide engineering services to the Certified Tempest Technical Authority section.

Mark supported the Certified Tempest Technical Authority section through answering technical customer service requests related to classified automated processing systems. These requests came from domestic and overseas Department offices ranging from responding in a timely manner to a technical question of how to handle and dispose of specialized computer processing equipment from an Information Resource Management (IRM) domestic office branch in Virginia to providing guidance on a wireless communication system for a Department office in Indonesia. In both of these cases, Mark's timely and informative technical guidance allowed both these domestic and foreign Department offices to maintain operational tempo thereby helping them to stay focused on meeting Department operational demands.

Prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams, in a timely manner, on product evaluations, identified vulnerabilities, countermeasures, and other technical matters as required.

Mark has demonstrated strong collaborative skills by co-authoring a comprehensive 19-page manual for engineers, technical users and field personnel on TEMPEST program requirements for classified information processing as well as guidelines for classified information processing inspections. The manual that Lenzi co-authored with other engineers from the Emanations Countermeasures Branch will provide hundreds of Security Engineering Officers, Information Management Officers, Regional Computer Security Officers and Regional Security Officers necessary information and guidelines to perform field inspections and/or assessments of procedural and physical TEMPEST countermeasures. Mr. Lenzi worked closely in a collaborative effort to design the manual to include a procedural checklist for computing and information processing systems inspections for Posts to perform on a regular basis.

Conduct TEMPEST Countermeasure reviews as directed by the CTTA

Mr. Lenzi has performed at a high level - particularly in written communications - as evidenced by his 30 November 2011 seven page classified memorandum for the Emanations Countermeasure Branch Chief and the Certified Tempest Technical Authority Section Chief that provided a summary of procedural and construction issues identified in a Technical Security Assessment for an embassy in Asia. This well written and succinct memorandum demonstrated Lenzi's impressive writing and analytical skills by making recommendations on how to mitigate some of the systemic procedural security issues that were occurring at the embassy.

Participate in an Overseas TDY.

Mark successfully completed a TDY to Afghanistan for two months during this rating period. He guided himself through the maze of prerequisite training, and the mountain of forms. As evidenced by the attached Memorandum of Performance. He performed very well under difficult and strenuous conditions some of which were not listed in the usual duties of a Security Engineering Officer.

**V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. For Career Candidates only: Assessment of career potential as a Foreign Service Officer or Foreign Service Specialist:**

- ☐ Unable to assess potential from observations to date
- ☐ Candidate is unlikely to serve effectively even with additional experience
- ☐ Candidate is likely to serve effectively but judgment is contingent on additional evaluated experience
- ☒ Candidate is recommended for tenure and can be expected to serve successfully across a normal career span (see instructions)  
 (Support your choice by discussing below the candidate's potential for successful service across a normal career span, citing examples which illustrate strengths and weaknesses in each of the competencies cited below.)

**B. For employees at Class FS-03 and below and all career candidates regardless of grade:**

For each of the competency groups listed below, draw on specific examples of performance to describe the rated employee's potential for advancement in the Service. (See Core Precepts for definitions of competencies.)

1. Leadership Skills 2. Managerial Skills 3. Interpersonal Skills 4. Communication and Foreign Language Skills  
 5. Intellectual Skills 6. Substantive Knowledge

**Leadership Skills:** During his Temporary Duty (TDY) to Afghanistan, Mark helped created an organization-wide environment which encouraged innovation by taking the initiative to design and build from the ground up a comprehensive wiring (signal and power) and mount system for a new installation of a \$330,000 Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) camera that was of vital importance to Embassy Kabul's security – especially for night operations. Anticipating and preparing for a future security situation in Afghanistan with American troop levels significantly reduced from current levels, Mark took not only a tactical but, more importantly, a long-term view of the project and acted as a catalyst and team leader for Security Engineering Officers, Navy Seabees, Facility Managers and Security Technical Specialists from the initial design to project completion.

**Managerial Skills:** Drawing upon managerial background before he joined the Department of State, Mark set a high standard for managerial performance. During his TDY to Afghanistan he established performance expectations in accordance with the Department's goals and objectives. An example of his managerial ability was brought out when he led both Navy Seabees and Security Technical Specialists on numerous security repair (e.g. various types of security locks, sliding gates, barriers, alarms, classified document shredders, etc.) and installation projects all around the country of Afghanistan.

**Interpersonal Skills:** On all of these diverse missions, Mark encouraged, developed and provided feedback to the efforts of staff working with and under him to enhance their effectiveness. Mark set for himself a high level of integrity and workplace behavior by example and instruction as demonstrated by the fact that he has never lost composure under stress or in crisis working in a variety of extremely difficult working environments whether in Washington or Afghanistan.

**Communication and Foreign Language Skills:** In addition to outstanding oral and written communication skills in the English language, during this rating period, Mark studied for and achieved a 2/2+ score for Russian language at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute which will qualifies him to receive language incentive pay when serving abroad in Russian speaking countries. Mark practiced and honed his Russian language skills while serving in Afghanistan during this rating period by communicating on security matters with Armenian armed forces personnel who were guarding the German military base he was stationed at in Mazar e Sharif while working at the future U.S. consulate.

**Intellectual Skills:** Mark has impressive and well rounded intellectual skills that go beyond his engineering skills. Personnel from the Department's Intelligence and Research (INR) Bureau and the Central Intelligence Agency continue to ask Mark, on an informal basis, for his analysis on political developments in the Eurasia region. This is an example of his varied intellectual skills being of significant value to the U.S. Government.

**Substantive Knowledge:** Mark has forged his previous foreign work and travel experience into a tool that has allowed him to integrate work flow and outreach efforts with other Departments and Agencies to monitor internal and external sources for information to analyze potential threats to Department personnel and facilities. To advance additional substantive knowledge, Mark has pro-actively utilized FSI training by taking such courses as Managing Your Time Effectively as well as the 40 hour Contract Officer Representative (CoR) course of which he passed the certification test and is CoR certified.



C. **Areas for Improvement:** The following must be completed. Employees should be made aware of areas where they should concentrate their efforts to improve. Specify at least one area in which he/she might best direct such efforts. Area(s) cited must be explicitly linked to one or more of the competency groups listed in Section V B and must have been discussed with the employee in counseling during the rating period. Justify your recommendation with examples and indicate below competency group(s) being addressed. *(The response is not to be directed as a need for formal training.)*

Specify Competency Substantive Knowledge Specify Competency \_\_\_\_\_

Mark has an excellent technical knowledge base. However, he should work to gain a better understanding of how Diplomatic Security interacts with other departments and agencies within an Embassy. I would recommend that he consult with other senior SEO's who have that experience at every opportunity.

#### VI. REVIEW STATEMENT *(Completed by Reviewer)*

Assess the employee's performance and potential (if a career candidate, potential to serve across a normal career span - see instructions). Independent observations are encouraged and must be supported by additional examples of performance observed this rating period. Note differences with the rater's appraisal or recommendations. Comment on relations between rater and employee.

Mark is a talented engineer. He was dependable, a team builder and an effective communicator in his role as a Security Engineering Officer within the ECB program. As a motivated self-starter, Mark made significant contributions to the DS mission. I agree with Gregg's assessment of this first tour SEO and recommend him for tenure as soon as possible. He was effective in his role supporting ECB, the CTTA and ST field offices overseas.

Mark was a very dependable employee during this rating period. For an engineer at his level, I could always depend on him to complete assignments as scheduled. In every situation, Mark would follow a task through to completion and finish according to the guidelines established. He was also proactive in the executing these tasks. I recall once when I assigned Mark to review a technical security assessment and to provide me with a summary of the post's profile. He delivered the recommendations within a few days and followed up with our SEO at post to get updates on the report before I tasked him to do so. He often worked to complete assignments ahead of their due dates. He effectively balancing day-to-day task with other assigned duties.

In the branch, teamwork is often a required aspect of the ECB. No one exhibited this concept better than Mark. He would always look to assist his fellow engineers on their tasks. For example, when a special project required a fellow SEO to abandon his regular tasks, Mark volunteered to cover his weekly reporting until the engineer returned two weeks later. He successfully managed his workload and these additional duties. He also displayed exceptional ease working with colleagues at all levels and in all roles. He helped with simple and collaborated on more complex tasks effortlessly. His work with another engineer and senior technicians on the TEMPEST checklist is a great example of Mark's ability. Mark consistently brought the team together.

Producing reports for the TEMPEST CTTA showed that Mark knew how to convey a positive, persuasive position in written form. He presented information in a clear and effective manner. Employing an understandable structure in the memos and reports, he always provided details appropriate to the audience whether it was the front office or the intelligence community. He also always took the time to proofread all written documents, thus minimizing any spelling or grammar errors. He was the person others would go to review their documents. He was open to learning from coworkers and hearing what they had to say.

During a 45-Day TDY, Mark was able to install alarm systems, repair force entry doors and perform general maintenance. His performance in the theatre gave Mark a firsthand perspective into the role of a SEO and that role supports the Department's mission. His impact was significant and stated by the technicians that worked with him. One told me that Mark was a great person and a hard worker. The Officer-in-Charge also thanked Mark for his service.

Mark's was a great asset to have in the branch. With his innate ability to positively engage people and execute the mission in Washington and in the field, Mark was very successful this rating period. I recommend the Department tenure him as soon as possible.



**VII. STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE**

**A. Discussion:** This section is intended to provide the rated employee's views on the period of performance appraised. You must comment on your most significant achievements during the period. You may also address any activities or problems not adequately covered in this report, or aspects of the appraisal which need clarification or correction. You are encouraged to state your current career goals including training and assignments desired over the next 5 years. *(Continuation sheets may be used.)*

I would first like to thank Messrs. Theriot and Johnstone for counseling and mentoring me. Their support has been invaluable. I am very proud of my work accomplishments for the State Department and it is due mostly to the team effort that I have been a part of in the Emanations and Countermeasures Branch (ECB) as well as in the Engineering Services Office at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan.

In addition to helping ECB support the field on a daily basis, I am most proud of helping to create an organization-wide environment which encourages innovation at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul by taking the initiative to design and build from the ground up a complex mount system for a new installation of an expensive Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) camera that was of vital importance to Embassy Kabul's security – especially for night operations. I feel this project showcased my managerial skills as I acted as a catalyst and team leader for Security Engineering Officers, Navy Seabees, Facility Managers and Security Technical Specialists from the initial design to project completion. I was especially pleased to recently receive feedback from Embassy Kabul that this FLIR system was used extensively and was of vital importance during a high profile and complex attack on the embassy on April 15, 2012.

I feel that my efforts to strengthen my foreign language skills over the last rating period are symbolic of the pro-active way in which I am always trying to better myself to more effectively serve the Department. I am proud that I tested at a level in Russian that qualifies me for a language bonus but, more importantly, learning this language has already had direct positive impact on my work in the field such as when I used Russian to communicate with military personnel from Armenia at a German army base in Mazar e Sharif, Afghanistan, when I was conducting a Technical Security Survey for the new U.S. consulate in that city.

My goals remain the same as when I joined the State Department: to continue to constantly better myself and be a leader within the organization to more effectively serve the Department to accomplish its strategic goal of creating a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community.

**B. I acknowledge receipt of this report.**

Date Section VII completed (mm-dd-yyyy)

05-02-2012

/s/ MARK LENZI

Employee's Signature

**PX-014**

See Instructions Before Completing

U.S. Department of State



# U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

## SUBMISSION CONTROL

DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-23-2013	DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-29-2013	DATE RELEASED TO DEPARTMENT FILES (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-30-2013
---	---	--

NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI)

LENZI, MARK R.

TYPE OF REPORT

☐ REGULAR ☒ CAREER CANDIDATE ☐ LNA ☐ VOLUNTARY

 INTERIM: ☒ Change of Rater ☐ Duties ☐ Assignment

GRADE

FS - 05

SSN

XXX-XX-4434

POSITION TITLE

SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER

POST OR ORGANIZATION

175233 - DS/CMP/ECB

PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy)

From 08-01-2012 To 04-15-2013

RATER: NICODEMUS, JAMES E.

GRADE: FS - 02

TITLE: EMANATIONS COUNTERMEASURES  
BRANCH CHIEF

REVIEWER: BARELA, MICHAEL J.

GRADE: FE - OC

TITLE: COUNTERMEASURES PROGRAM  
DIVISION DIRECTOR

After careful review, I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.

A. /s/ JAMES NICODEMUS  
Rater's signature upon completion of Sections I, III, IV, and V04-23-2013  
Date (mm-dd-yyyy)B. /s/ MICHAEL BARELA  
Reviewer's signature upon completion of Section VI04-23-2013  
Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## I. CERTIFICATION - WORK REQUIREMENTS AND COUNSELING

Work requirements were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) 08-15-2012

If applicable, requirements were revised on (mm-dd-yyyy) \_\_\_\_\_

Rater and rated employee held counseling sessions to discuss performance on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)

1. 01-29-2013 2. 02-15-2013 3. 03-22-2013 4. \_\_\_\_\_

In the case of an unsatisfactory performance rating, this is also to certify that the requirements of 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 (tenured employees), 3 FAH-1 H-2326 (employees subject to administrative promotion), or 3 FAM 2248 (FSO Career Candidates) have been met.

I certify that counseling sessions took place during the rating period and that at least one of them was documented in writing using the Counseling Certification Form (DS-1974).

/s/ JAMES NICODEMUS  
Rating Officer/s/ MARK LENZI  
Rated Employee04-23-2013  
Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## II. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)

A. **Examples of Performance:** Specific examples have been provided in all sections ☒ Yes (If not, return for rewrite)B. **Certification:** This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material.04-23-2013  
Date (mm-dd-yyyy)ERIK S. WINTERHALTER  
Panel Chairperson's Name - Type/s/ ERIK WINTERHALTER  
SignatureC. **Comments:** (If submitted late, indicate who is responsible for delay.)

**III. EMPLOYEE'S POSITION AND WORK REQUIREMENTS (Established by Rater, Reviewer and Employee)**

A. Describe the position and where it fits in the staffing pattern; indicate the number and kind of employees supervised or team affiliation(s) and tasking(s), whichever is applicable.

Incumbent is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the TEMPEST Countermeasures section in the Emanations Countermeasures Branch (ECB), Countermeasures Programs Division, Office of Security Technology in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. The TEMPEST Countermeasures section is the Department's sole technical authority for TEMPEST countermeasures and requirements for all domestic and overseas missions. The section ensures compliance with technical security standards and countermeasures through TEMPEST countermeasure surveys and review of existing policies. The incumbent does not directly supervise any personnel but does serve as team leader, directing other SEOs and contactors on various projects.

B. Divide work requirements into two categories: continuing responsibilities and specific objectives (including, as appropriate, professional development activities), listing these in descending priority order.

**CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. Provide engineering services to the Certified TEMPEST Technical Authority (CTTA) section.
2. Assist with TEMPEST Countermeasure reviews as directed by the CTTA.
3. Interface with other bureaus and agencies to meet the goals of the TEMPEST Countermeasures section.
4. Prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams, in a timely manner, on product evaluations, identified vulnerabilities, countermeasures, and other technical matters as required. Review and make recommendations for Foreign Affairs Manual and Handbook policies.
5. Prepare written products that communicate technical matters or convey recommendations for decision-making by the ECB Chief.
6. Apply internal control measures to protect organizational integrity and prevent unauthorized disclosure of classified and sensitive materials, report security incidents to the appropriate management officials, and properly safeguard all classified and sensitive materials and equipment in assigned areas.
7. Develop and maintain a clear understanding of Diplomatic Security policies, standards, and regulations, including relevant Foreign Affairs Manuals and Handbooks.
8. Ensure that all physical, material, and human resources are safeguarded against waste, fraud, and unauthorized use or misappropriation, obligations incurred comply with applicable laws and regulations, and revenues and expenditures pertaining to the incumbent's operation are promptly recorded and accounted for in accordance with Department procedures.
9. Adhere to established U.S. Government Equal Employment Opportunities and diversity policies.
10. Direct other Security Engineering Officers, interns, and contractors as assigned.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:**

1. Continue to learn about the other branches and sections within the Countermeasures Program Division and undertake trainings and activities that advance Diplomatic Security's counter-terrorism and interagency activities.
2. Provide technical security support to the Engineering Services Center of U.S. Embassy Manila through an overseas training trip sponsored by the Security Technical Operations Division.
3. Continue to assist the Technical Security Countermeasures Branch with telephone inspections.
4. Seek training opportunities that will both enhance job performance and support office objectives.
5. Assist the Office of Security Technology on special projects on an as needed basis.

C. Describe any special circumstances influencing the work program.

The budget for ECB will take a 15 percent funding cut in FY 2013 that will require the TEMPEST Countermeasures section to modify support roles to meet performance goals within budget constraints. Additionally, six of the branch's nine Security Engineering Officers are entry level and will periodically be out of the office for training requirements which will require Mark to assume additional responsibilities and assist other sections within ECB throughout the year. Mark is serving in a FS-04 position in a stretch capacity.

**IV. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rater)**

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

**A. General Appraisal:**

All Employees: Performance was satisfactory or better (If no, see instructions for documenting unsatisfactory performance)

YES	NO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B. Limited-Non-Career Appointees:**

Employee is recommended for extension if required by service needs.

YES	NO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C. Discussion:**

Identify at least three of the work requirements including continuing responsibilities and/or specific objectives listed in Section III. For each, using examples, describe the employee's performance and accomplishments.

Mark Lenzi is approaching the end of quite a solid tour with Emanations Countermeasures Branch (ECB) and will be missed. Throughout his tenure with ECB, Mark has ensured Emanations Countermeasures Branch met Diplomatic Security goals through his decisive and flexible approach to challenging policy and engineering issues. He has augmented his skills through leadership training that he has used in practical ways to advance the branch's goals. Mark definitely should be promoted to FS-04 and tenured at the earliest opportunity.

Last year Mark was selected to participate in - and graduated from - the Joint Special Operations University's prestigious Combating Terrorist Networks interagency course at MacDill Air Force Base in Florida. During this course Mark presented to his peers his past experience working in combat environments in Iraq and Afghanistan and was called on to describe to his classmates from the U.S. military and various U.S. government agencies specific, detailed best practices experiences from working on high profile security projects for Diplomatic Security in Kabul and Herat, Afghanistan.

As part of his efforts to increase his work production for the Emanations Countermeasures Branch, Mark pro-actively pursued many training opportunities which he parlayed into improved work performance. The training that he has taken over the course of this rating period include the twenty-two week Basic Security Engineering Officer Fundamentals training program in conjunction with the National Security Agency's Interagency Training Center. In his training evaluation report of Mark, Security Evaluation Branch Chief Jose Moreno wrote "my staff and I observed SEO Lenzi's positive attitude toward the training requirements; his respect for and assistance to his co-workers and instructors. He is very likely to serve successfully over a normal career span." Mark aptly applied principles learned from these courses when he assisted the Engineering Services Center in Manila, Philippines on several important projects, including extensive work on the Embassy's public address system. Mark's efforts were so well received that the Officer in Charge invited Mark to extend his visit to complete a few ongoing projects.

Mark provided superior engineering services to the Certified Tempest Technical Authority section, especially through his adept handling of complicated customer service requests and providing technical assistance and advice on TEMPEST and emanations countermeasures issues. These requests often came from embassies that are working at high operational levels such as Kabul and Baghdad. In numerous cases, Mark's timely and informative technical guidance allowed field offices to maintain operational tempo thereby helping them to stay focused on meeting Department operational demands. He led efforts to prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams in a timely manner on security vulnerabilities at posts and designed mitigation efforts custom tailored for the security challenges and requirements for specific posts. Over the course of this rating period, he superbly responded to posts and their inquiries in a highly professional manner, and the utmost level of customer service.

As part of his duties for Diplomatic Security's TEMPEST program, Mark took the lead in coordinating an inter-Bureau design review process for a consulate in the Middle East. Mark demonstrated his collaborative skills by working with the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations to develop a working strategy to mitigate potential technical threat issues while laying the groundwork for construction of a key component of the consulate to increase its operational readiness. On this project in particular, Mark made concise and pertinent recommendations to not only the Bureau of Diplomatic Security but also the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations.

Mark is preparing to depart ECB this summer for onward assignment with the Technical Security Countermeasures Branch. I am positive he will continue to expand his capabilities as an SEO and will serve his new office with the same distinction as he has served ECB.



**V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. For Career Candidates only: Assessment of career potential as a Foreign Service Officer or Foreign Service Specialist:**

- ☐ Unable to assess potential from observations to date
- ☐ Candidate is unlikely to serve effectively even with additional experience
- ☐ Candidate is likely to serve effectively but judgment is contingent on additional evaluated experience
- ☒ Candidate is recommended for tenure and can be expected to serve successfully across a normal career span (see instructions)  
(Support your choice by discussing below the candidate's potential for successful service across a normal career span, citing examples which illustrate strengths and weaknesses in each of the competencies cited below.)

**B. For all career candidates regardless of grade:**

For each of the competency groups listed below, draw on specific examples of performance to describe the rated employee's potential for advancement in the Service. (See Core Precepts for definitions of competencies.)

1. Leadership Skills 2. Managerial Skills 3. Interpersonal Skills 4. Communication and Foreign Language Skills  
5. Intellectual Skills 6. Substantive Knowledge

**Note: This section should be left blank for Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs).**

Mark consistently demonstrates outstanding performance as a Security Engineering Officer and has demonstrated the ability to serve a long and fruitful career with the Foreign Service. He should be tenured at the first available opportunity.

Mark demonstrated impressive leadership skills during his three week support visit to Manila, Philippines when leading a team of other junior Security Engineers, Security Technical Specialists, and Navy Seabees to diagnose and repair security cameras that were exhibiting poor video quality. Mark analyzed the problem and then led a brainstorming session with technicians and engineers on possible solutions. Instead of separating power lines from the signal which was suggested and would have been a costly solution, Mark led an effort to install ground loop isolators on the camera wiring. This fully solved the problem and potentially saved the government thousands of dollars in budget and time costs had the lines been dug up and separated as was originally suggested.

Mark set a high standard for managerial performance. He established and clearly communicated performance expectations in accordance with the Department's goals and objectives. He inspired a high level of performance in ECB staff – ranging from an intern that he developed in-depth training programs to the large number of entry-level engineers in the Division. Mark regularly volunteers to take lead on projects to ensure customer requirements are completed on schedule and works directly with our Division's front office staff to ensure Branch replies to field requests are clear and fully understood. Recently, Mark worked with personnel in a different Diplomatic Security office to assist them to answer a computer security question to ECB that fell outside of our purview. Inter-office efforts such as this greatly contribute to a positive view of the Countermeasures Program division by posts which, in the long run, increases adherence of security policies in the field.

Mark's interpersonal skills are excellent and set the standard for integrity and workplace behavior in our office. Mark has always fostered a work place climate based on mutual respect and trust, whether it be out in the field participating in the decertification of a classified material diplomatic shipping container with State Department and U.S. Naval personnel while in Asia or at interagency working group meetings and technical product evaluations with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Security Agency and other U.S. Government agencies here in the States.

Mark exhibits full mastery of written communication as demonstrated by his internal technical memorandums and policy guidance revision suggestions. His work as the ECB help desk officer to support missions abroad and field personnel demonstrates his sophisticated ability to analyze, synthesize, and advocate in a timely manner. Mark made very important edits to draft Foreign Affairs Manual policy that will guide ECB future efforts to mitigate risks for posts to deploy secure video teleconferencing worldwide. Mark also continued to practice his Russian language skills that are currently at the 2/2+ level which qualifies him to receive language incentive pay when posted abroad in Russian speaking countries. That Mark has continually practiced and honed his Russian language skills during this rating period is testament to his commitment to become a well rounded member of the Foreign Service.

Mark demonstrated high level intellectual skills when he worked with his section chief and others in Diplomatic Security to develop a viable solution to an important project in Iraq which involved protection of employees working in country and a key step in the U.S. glide path plan for Iraq. Mark identified issues with power systems and directed Bureau of Overseas Operations personnel to correct outstanding deficiencies.

Mark greatly increased his substantive knowledge through a grueling course of security engineering courses, all totaled over twenty-four weeks of coursework. He skillfully incorporated what he learned to solve issues arising in ECB to formulate and implement policies and programs that advance the overarching agenda of Diplomatic Security's Countermeasures Program.

C. **Areas for Improvement:** The following must be completed. Employees should be made aware of areas where they should concentrate their efforts to improve. Specify at least one area in which he/she might best direct such efforts. Area(s) cited must be explicitly linked to one or more of the competency groups listed in Section V B and must have been discussed with the employee in counseling during the rating period. Justify your recommendation with examples and indicate below competency group(s) being addressed. *(The response is not to be directed as a need for formal training.)*

Specify Competency Substantive Knowledge Specify Competency \_\_\_\_\_

Mark has developed a knowledge of important State Department technical policies that far surpasses any of his peers through his tenure with CMP. He should compliment these skills by developing a better understanding of how Diplomatic Security management formulates policy decisions and communicates these directives to other bureaus and diplomatic missions within the Department. I recommend that he continue to seek the advice of myself and other senior SEO's to gain a better understanding of Diplomatic Security's policy formulation process.

#### VI. REVIEW STATEMENT *(Completed by Reviewer)*

Assess the employee's performance and potential (if a career candidate, potential to serve across a normal career span - see instructions). Independent observations are encouraged and must be supported by additional examples of performance observed this rating period. Note differences with the rater's appraisal or recommendations. Comment on relations between rater and employee.

Mark Lenzi has demonstrated excellent technical and analytical skill as Security Engineer in the Emanations Countermeasures Branch this year. His leadership was important in ensuring a number of high priority projects were kept on schedule and the branch was able to achieve bureau goals.

Emanations Countermeasures Branch technical evaluations identify potential hardware and software to further its work to protect diplomatic missions worldwide. Mark effectively uses his technical and analytical skills to evaluate numerous security products ranging from radio frequency and infrared shielded windows to high tech short range infrared cameras. Mark demonstrated his analytical writing skills by drafting a countermeasures equipment acquisition strategy based on his product evaluations. Mark's excellent writing was further applied to cogent technical memorandums and policy and guidance revisions. This includes policy for the Department's secure video teleconferencing systems. Mark also demonstrated his excellent technical and communication skills as an Emanations Countermeasures Branch help desk officer. Providing technical support to personnel in missions abroad, his ability to solicit requirements and provide support in a timely manner has ensured the program meets or exceeds customer expectations.

Mark's work included a very important organizational role for a planned countermeasures program abroad. He coordinated participation and involvement by technical experts in other Federal agencies. Mark developed work strategies and team rosters to ensure roles and responsibilities were understood. The program is about to launch and I credit Mark with significantly contributing to the preparation and organization of this classified effort.

Mark and his rater, James Nicodemus, work closely to review branch metrics and goals and develop strategies for exceeding management expectations. Mark has accepted a diverse array of assignments and through his strong analytical skill set been fully successful in his assigned duties.

Mark is a dedicated, talented officer and manager who understands the Department and the Foreign Affairs community. I agree with the rater that he should be considered for tenure. His assignment to another branch within our division this summer will allow for further demonstration of his technical countermeasures skills and broaden his knowledge of counterintelligence tradecraft abroad.

**VII. STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE**

**A. Discussion:** This section is intended to provide the rated employee's views on the period of performance appraised. You must comment on your most significant achievements during the period. You may also address any activities or problems not adequately covered in this report, or aspects of the appraisal which need clarification or correction. Career Candidates are encouraged to state their current career goals including training and assignments desired over the next 5 years.  
 (Continuation sheets may be used.)

I would like to thank my Rating and Reviewing Officers for mentoring and counseling me. Their encouragement and support has been very beneficial. I remain proud of my work accomplishments for the State Department and for trying to foster a team spirit both inside and outside the office such as by playing on the State Department basketball team after work or on temporary duty to Embassy Manila where I helped build team spirit between the Marine Security Guards and the Engineering Services Center by playing for the Marine Security Guards' basketball team.

During a temporary duty assignment to the Philippines during this rating period, I was able to work on alarm systems, change locks, design a layout for a Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) system at an embassy compound, conduct Radio Frequency testing, work with Navy Seabees on classified safe repairs, de-certify a classified shipment container, and perform general security engineering duties at Post. I feel my impact was profound and my excellent performance was noted by the technicians and other security engineers that worked with me.

I am also proud of the fact that during this rating period I have been called upon to use my extensive prior work experience in Eastern Europe and contacts in the Eurasia region to provide political analysis and insight to analysts from the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), National Security Agency (NSA), and the Department's Intelligence and Research Bureau (INR). These analysts have called upon me to provide political insight because they know from my work prior to joining the Department and my educational background that I am often able to correctly predict political trends in the Eurasia region when information and analysis is often incomplete. I also briefed Ambassador Richard Norland on Georgian politics before he departed for Post in the summer of 2012. My interagency work has provided key experience and contacts across government that have helped me immensely in my work for Diplomatic Security such as a classified interagency project that I am now performing at a critical threat post in Europe. I have been able to use my past engineering, political and language skills working in this particular country in Eastern Europe as well as my prior experience working with interagency teams to effectively prepare a 20+ person interagency team for the mission and play an effective role on the ground in a complex and difficult security working environment.

My goals remain the same as last year and when I joined the State Department: to continue to constantly better myself and be a leader within the organization to more effectively serve the Department to accomplish its strategic goal of creating a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community.

**B. I acknowledge receipt of this report.**

Date Section VII completed (mm-dd-yyyy)

04-23-2013

/s/ MARK LENZI

Employee's Signature



**PX-015**

See Instructions Before Completing

U.S. Department of State



# U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

## SUBMISSION CONTROL

DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-23-2014	DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-23-2014	DATE RELEASED TO DEPARTMENT FILES (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-27-2014
---	---	--

NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI)

LENZI, MARK R.

TYPE OF REPORT

☐ REGULAR ☒ CAREER CANDIDATE ☐ LNA ☐ VOLUNTARY

 INTERIM: ☐ Change of Rater ☐ Duties ☐ Assignment

GRADE

FS - 04

SSN

XXX-XX-4434

POSITION TITLE

SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER

POST OR ORGANIZATION

175231 - DS/CMP/TSC

PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy)

From 08-07-2013 To 04-15-2014

RATER: BATCHELOR, JEFFREY B.

GRADE: FS - 01

TITLE: BRANCH CHIEF

REVIEWER: BARELA, MICHAEL J.

GRADE: FE - OC

TITLE: DIVISION DIRECTOR

After careful review, I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.

 A. /s/ JEFFREY BATCHELOR  
 Rater's signature upon completion of Sections I, III, IV, and V

05-19-2014  
 Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

 B. /s/ MICHAEL BARELA  
 Reviewer's signature upon completion of Section VI

05-19-2014  
 Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## I. CERTIFICATION - WORK REQUIREMENTS AND COUNSELING

 Work requirements were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) 09-26-2013

If applicable, requirements were revised on (mm-dd-yyyy) \_\_\_\_\_

Rater and rated employee held counseling sessions to discuss performance on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)

 1. 09-26-2013 2. 01-15-2014 3. \_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_

In the case of an unsatisfactory performance rating, this is also to certify that the requirements of 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 (tenured employees), 3 FAH-1 H-2326 (employees subject to administrative promotion), or 3 FAM 2248 (FSO Career Candidates) have been met.

I certify that counseling sessions took place during the rating period and that at least one of them was documented in writing using the Counseling Certification Form (DS-1974).

/s/ JEFFREY BATCHELOR  
 Rating Officer

/s/ MARK LENZI  
 Rated Employee

05-16-2014  
 Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## II. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)

 A. **Examples of Performance:** Specific examples have been provided in all sections ☒ Yes (If not, return for rewrite)

 B. **Certification:** This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material.

05-23-2014  
 Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

THOMAS J. COLIN  
 Panel Chairperson's Name - Type

/s/ THOMAS COLIN  
 Signature

 C. **Comments:** (If submitted late, indicate who is responsible for delay.)

**III. EMPLOYEE'S POSITION AND WORK REQUIREMENTS (Established by Rater, Reviewer and Employee)**

A. Describe the position and where it fits in the staffing pattern; indicate the number and kind of employees supervised or team affiliation(s) and tasking(s), whichever is applicable.

The incumbent is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSC) Branch under the Countermeasures Program (CMP) Division within the Office of Security Technology (ST). The incumbent reports to the TSC Branch Chief. The incumbent will supervise contract staff and take part in support trips as the lead engineer or as a team member. He will also serve as the TSC liaison to the Special Countermeasures Program (SCP).

B. Divide work requirements into two categories: continuing responsibilities and specific objectives (including, as appropriate, professional development activities), listing these in descending priority order.

**CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. Work with the SCP section chief on overseas and domestic projects.
2. In a timely manner, prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams on product evaluations, identified vulnerabilities, countermeasures, and other technical matters as required.
3. Apply internal control measures to protect organizational integrity and prevent unauthorized disclosure of classified and sensitive materials, report security incidents to the appropriate management officials, and properly safeguard all classified and sensitive materials and equipment in assigned areas.
4. Ensure that all physical, material, and human resources are safeguarded against waste, fraud, and unauthorized use of misappropriation, that all obligations incurred comply with applicable laws and regulations, and that all revenues and expenditures pertaining to the incumbent's operation are promptly recorded and accounted for in accordance with Department of State procedures.
5. Uphold the principles of Equal Employment Opportunity.
6. Perform other duties as required and assigned.
7. Monitor and assist with maintaining the SCP budget.
8. Coordinate and network within the intelligence community to conduct and evaluate new technologies.
9. Continue development of Concept of Operations methodology to improve the TSC Branch programs.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:**

1. Take the Overseas Security Engineering Officer course in preparation for an overseas assignment.
2. Participate in at least one SCP support trip.

C. Describe any special circumstances influencing the work program.

**IV. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rater)**

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

**A. General Appraisal:**

All Employees: Performance was satisfactory or better (If no, see instructions for documenting unsatisfactory performance)

YES	NO
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B. Limited-Non-Career Appointees:**

Employee is recommended for extension if required by service needs.

YES	NO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C. Discussion:**

Identify at least three of the work requirements including continuing responsibilities and/or specific objectives listed in Section III. For each, using examples, describe the employee's performance and accomplishments.

Mark Lenzi has thrived as a Security Engineering Officer in the Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSC) Branch. Mark is in a unique position as the TSC liaison to the Special Countermeasures Program and is one of the few Security Engineering Officers to work on a daily basis with members of the Intelligence Community and on Special Access Programs dealing with some of the most cutting edge security and technology challenges facing the Department of State. Mark has performed at an extremely high level in difficult and challenging overseas environments and has shown he has the potential to serve effectively within the Department of State and at higher levels of responsibility. Tenure and promotion to FS-03 are highly recommended.

Mark continues to advance TSC's goals through a well-rounded and practical approach to working with other offices in the Department of State and other agencies on some of the most profound technical security challenges facing the United States. As TSC's liaison to - and Deputy Program Manager of - Diplomatic Security's Special Countermeasures Program, Mark has provided effective support to the Department of State and U.S. Government as a whole. During this rating period, Mark led the planning and execution of a five member interagency team on a three week overseas deployment to conduct specialized technical support. Mark provided interagency coordination and took the lead in working with other U.S. Government agencies that had contributed personnel and technical support to the mission. Over the course of the project, Mark showed great flexibility in widely diverse situations that ran the gamut from doing extreme physical labor with various hand tools to briefing a U.S. Ambassador. Much of the success of this project can be attributed to Mark's hard work.

Mark is cognizant that he will be sent overseas within the next two years and has taken an active role to increase his overall knowledge of overseas operations. In preparation of his upcoming overseas assignment, Mark took a six week Overseas Security Engineering Officer course from October to December 2013. This course dealt with such issues as how to install and repair different types of high security alarm systems, surveillance cameras, security locks, computer networking equipment, tear gas systems, and physical barrier equipment such as mechanical Delta barriers. All of this equipment can be found at our overseas locations and his participation in this course will increase his familiarity and overall effectiveness with the equipment.

Mark has also worked extensively with the DS Training Center and other agencies to evaluate a technical system that can act as a countermeasure to a particular threat facing U.S. missions worldwide. Mark conducted extensive research to identify and track the particular threat and then worked with various elements within the State Department and outside agencies to test and evaluate the countermeasure. He then drafted an extremely well written and succinct memorandum that clearly delineated the threat, identified the countermeasure testing procedure, and made substantive recommendations. This memorandum was widely distributed and praised by management within the Department. It is an excellent example of Mark's pro-active and collaborative interagency approach to solving technical challenges.

**V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. For Career Candidates only: Assessment of career potential as a Foreign Service Officer or Foreign Service Specialist:**

- ☐ Unable to assess potential from observations to date
- ☐ Candidate is unlikely to serve effectively even with additional experience
- ☐ Candidate is likely to serve effectively but judgment is contingent on additional evaluated experience
- ☒ Candidate is recommended for tenure and can be expected to serve successfully across a normal career span (see instructions)  
 (Support your choice by discussing below the candidate's potential for successful service across a normal career span, citing examples which illustrate strengths and weaknesses in each of the competencies cited below.)

**B. For all career candidates regardless of grade:**

For each of the competency groups listed below, draw on specific examples of performance to describe the rated employee's potential for advancement in the Service. (See Core Precepts for definitions of competencies.)

1. Leadership Skills 2. Managerial Skills 3. Interpersonal Skills 4. Communication and Foreign Language Skills  
 5. Intellectual Skills 6. Substantive Knowledge

**Note: This section should be left blank for Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs).**

It is important to note that Mark's intellectual skills are far greater than simply his engineering knowledge. Mark integrates a wide range of information and experience which allows him to maintain ongoing relationships with his peers in the Department and his colleagues in other agencies. These ongoing relationships give him a better understanding of the overarching context of physical and technical threat reporting associated with Department of State facilities. This knowledge enhances his ability to implement more effective and focused technical security support.

Mark's interpersonal skills are excellent and set a standard workplace behavior as demonstrated by the fact that he consistently remains composed under stressful work situations that are prevalent in overseas work environments. Mark is also cognizant that he is part of a team and always strives to engender mutual respect and trust with everyone he works with.

Mark exhibits full mastery of written communication and had been particularly proficient with assisting the Special Countermeasures Program (SCP) director with internal technical memorandums and policy guidance. He also led an effort to implement a comprehensive testing and evaluation protocol for a complex technical countermeasures system. This effort was done in conjunction with interagency partners and demonstrated a sophisticated ability to analyze, synthesize, and advocate in a timely manner. Leading various agencies and personnel in this effort required excellent managerial skills and required clear communication on performance expectations and objectives.

As a team leader Mark strives to inspire a high level of performance and has encouraged, developed, and rewarded efforts of his team members to enhance their effectiveness. During a recent trip to a post in a challenging technical work environment, Mark demonstrated excellent leadership skills and won praise for improving team morale by organizing and participating in athletic activities such as basketball and competitive ice skating.

In the area of communication and foreign language skills, Mark exhibits a number of qualities that have made him very effective in his activities. In addition to excellent oral and written communication skills, Mark has continued to work on his Russian language skills and has put these skills to good use during his visits to Russian speaking locations. During several support visits Mark was involved in interagency technical operations where he communicated extensively in the Russian language and was called on to translate for other Security Engineering Officers. This linguistic ability enhanced the operational effectiveness of the team.

The substantive knowledge that Mark brings to being a Security Engineering Officer is impressive. With his extensive overseas and interagency experience combined with his language and engineering skills, he is able to effectively operate in overseas environments and on interagency projects. He has also been proficient at assisting with the formulation and implementation of SCP policies and programs that have advanced Diplomatic Security's Countermeasures Program. Mark continually monitors internal and external sources for information and ideas and uses this knowledge to shape outcomes that are beneficial to the SCP program.

C. **Areas for Improvement:** The following must be completed. Employees should be made aware of areas where they should concentrate their efforts to improve. Specify at least one area in which he/she might best direct such efforts. Area(s) cited must be explicitly linked to one or more of the competency groups listed in Section V B and must have been discussed with the employee in counseling during the rating period. Justify your recommendation with examples and indicate below competency group(s) being addressed. *(The response is not to be directed as a need for formal training.)*

Specify Competency Substantive Knowledge Specify Competency \_\_\_\_\_

Mark has been very effective in his role as SCP liaison and is very knowledgeable about the program's policies and procedures but his knowledge of overseas field operations and other DS activities is not complete. That said, he is a new officer and this lack of knowledge is understandable. I have no doubt his knowledge gaps will be addressed once he has an overseas assignment and more experience.

#### VI. REVIEW STATEMENT *(Completed by Reviewer)*

Assess the employee's performance and potential (if a career candidate, potential to serve across a normal career span - see instructions). Independent observations are encouraged and must be supported by additional examples of performance observed this rating period. Note differences with the rater's appraisal or recommendations. Comment on relations between rater and employee.

Mark Lenzi demonstrates engineering skill in working on a diverse set of responsibilities in support of our most sensitive missions abroad. His interpersonal skills are excellent; his language aptitude has furthered program work on numerous occasions.

I commend Mark on his choice of the Technical Surveillance Countermeasures branch as a second domestic assignment. His skill set and performance earned him assignment to our Special Countermeasures Program, which provides protection to our most vulnerable technical counterintelligence posts. Mark distinguished himself in a number of assignments. A special program to review a facility prior to deconstruction was enhanced by Mark's leadership, technical acumen, and liaison with other counterintelligence agencies. Mark's excellent technical ability was demonstrated in a special program to evaluate a class of vulnerabilities at two missions this period. His work abroad was excellent and his liaison with post management informative. Mark collaborated with the investigative team and drafted compelling reporting to be reviewed within the interagency.

Mark has many personal and professional contacts within foreign affairs, with U.S. officials, and policy makers in other countries. His knowledge of current events and interactions among officials provides him professional and personal insight. But Mark's direct discussion with an Ambassador this period led to an issue. His outreach to the U.S. Ambassador to Kyiv after a media leak resulted in the mission having expectations contrary to ongoing Department efforts. Despite the Ambassador and RSO thanking Mark for his offer to assist and their desire for him to look into two specific issues, I requested that Mark disengage from this issue and he did so immediately. During this rating period, Rater Batchelor has discussed policies with Mark to clarify chain of command and bureau policy on discussions. Mark has focused himself on assigned tasks, which he completed promptly and efficiently.

Rater Brian Batchelor and Mark have held several formal and informal discussions on performance, career information, and expectations. Mark has benefited from these discussions. He is diligent in applying himself to assigned projects and his work has been successful as a result. I believe Mark is a bright, capable engineer who has shown potential to have a successful career in the Foreign Service. I agree that he should be considered for tenure. Additional performance at grade is recommended.



**VII. STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE**

**A. Discussion:** This section is intended to provide the rated employee's views on the period of performance appraised. You must comment on your most significant achievements during the period. You may also address any activities or problems not adequately covered in this report, or aspects of the appraisal which need clarification or correction. Career Candidates are encouraged to state their current career goals including training and assignments desired over the next 5 years.  
*(Continuation sheets may be used.)*

I am extremely proud to work for Diplomatic Security, especially with the JASONs Advisory Group and two of their quantum physics professors from Yale and Harvard on a complex electrical security project involving highly threatened posts in Asia and Europe. What I love about my job, and believe my work reflects, is that I feel as comfortable working on challenging technical security issues with leading academics as I do handling radars and drills in various missions around the world.

Being selected by the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) to work directly on Special Access Programs with the Intelligence Community on technical issues of extreme importance overseas has been a distinct honor. I look forward to continuing this and building relationships within both the State Department and the Intelligence Community to broaden my Security Engineering Officer skills and advance U.S. foreign policy priorities.

Some of the work that I feel has been of most impact for DS during this rating period is a lessons learned write-up I did on a large scale terrorist attack that occurred at Consulate Herat. In 2012, I put considerable effort into repairing a main sliding vehicle gate for the consulate. During this rating period this gate withstood a major Vehicle Borne Improvised Explosive Device (VBIED) attack and attempts by terrorists to breach it which gave U.S. security personnel the time necessary to neutralize them as threats to American personnel. The DS Physical Security Research and Development Branch Chief wrote to praise my Herat write-up, noting it could help Diplomatic Security's Training Center apply lessons learned and better educate DS personnel to defend against similar attacks elsewhere.

I would like to thank my Rating and Reviewing Officers as well as the senior officers in DS and beyond who have mentored me. Their support and encouragement to take a holistic approach when trying to solve issues vital to the Department has been extremely beneficial to my career development.

My long term goals remain the same as when I joined the Department: to continue to better myself and help our organization create a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the American people and the international community. Regarding short term goals I hope to receive tenure this year, as this and previous EERs recommend. I also look forward to leading more DS interagency teams on TDYs to challenging overseas posts, like the ones cited by my Rater that drew on my engineering and management skills and where I used my near-fluent Russian language skills during both work and personal interactions to make our team more cohesive and our work more efficient. For my next assignment, I feel I am ready to contribute in an overseas SEO position at a regional Engineering Services Center and look forward to this opportunity.

**B. I acknowledge receipt of this report.**

Date Section VII completed (mm-dd-yyyy)

05-23-2014

/s/ MARK LENZI

Employee's Signature

**PX-016**



See Instructions Before Completing

U.S. Department of State



# U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

## SUBMISSION CONTROL

DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-28-2015	DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 06-01-2015	DATE RELEASED TO DEPARTMENT FILES (mm-dd-yyyy) 06-02-2015
---	---	--

NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI)

LENZI, MARK R.

TYPE OF REPORT

☐ REGULAR ☒ CAREER CANDIDATE ☐ LNA ☐ VOLUNTARY

 INTERIM: ☐ Change of Rater ☐ Duties ☒ Assignment

GRADE

FS - 04

SSN

XXX-XX-4434

POSITION TITLE

SECURITY OFCR - ENGINEERING

POST OR ORGANIZATION

175231 - DS/CMP/TSC

PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy)

From 04-16-2014 To 09-12-2014

RATER: WANG, EGAN Y.

GRADE: FS - 02

TITLE: OPERATIONS CHIEF

REVIEWER: BATTISTONE, GREGORY F.

GRADE: FS - 01

TITLE: BRANCH CHIEF

After careful review, I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.

A. /s/ EGAN WANG

Rater's signature upon completion of Sections I, III, IV, and V

05-28-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

B. /s/ GREGORY BATTISTONE

Reviewer's signature upon completion of Section VI

05-28-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## I. CERTIFICATION - WORK REQUIREMENTS AND COUNSELING

Work requirements were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-17-2014

If applicable, requirements were revised on (mm-dd-yyyy)

Rater and rated employee held counseling sessions to discuss performance on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)

1. 05-06-2014 2. 07-21-2014 3. 4.

In the case of an unsatisfactory performance rating, this is also to certify that the requirements of 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 (tenured employees), 3 FAH-1 H-2326 (employees subject to administrative promotion), or 3 FAM 2248 (FSO Career Candidates) have been met.

I certify that counseling sessions took place during the rating period and that at least one of them was documented in writing using the Counseling Certification Form (DS-1974).

/s/ EGAN WANG

Rating Officer

/s/ MARK LENZI

Rated Employee

05-22-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## II. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)

A. **Examples of Performance:** Specific examples have been provided in all sections ☒ Yes (If not, return for rewrite)B. **Certification:** This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material.

05-28-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

CARLOS F. MATUS

Panel Chairperson's Name - Type

/s/ CARLOS MATUS

Signature

C. **Comments:** (If submitted late, indicate who is responsible for delay.)

**III. EMPLOYEE'S POSITION AND WORK REQUIREMENTS (Established by Rater, Reviewer and Employee)**

A. Describe the position and where it fits in the staffing pattern; indicate the number and kind of employees supervised or team affiliation(s) and tasking(s), whichever is applicable.

The incumbent is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSC) Branch under the Countermeasures Program (CMP) Division within the Office of Security Technology (ST). The incumbent reports to the Operations Chief and is rated by the TSC Branch Chief. As a relatively new SEO, the incumbent will increase his knowledge of Diplomatic Security policies, procedures, and practices. In addition, he will supervise contract staff and take part in support trips as the lead engineer or as a team member, as required, and will also serve as the TSC liaison to the Special Countermeasures Program (SCP).

B. Divide work requirements into two categories: continuing responsibilities and specific objectives (including, as appropriate, professional development activities), listing these in descending priority order.

**CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. Manage the Department's Technical Security Countermeasures (TSCM) overseas inspection program.
2. In a timely manner, prepare written correspondence, reports, and telegrams on product evaluations, identified vulnerabilities, countermeasures, and other technical matters, as required.
3. Apply internal control measures to protect organizational integrity and prevent unauthorized disclosure of classified and sensitive materials, report security incidents to the appropriate management officials, and properly safeguard all classified and sensitive materials and equipment in assigned areas.
4. Ensure that all physical, material, and human resources are safeguarded against waste, fraud, and unauthorized use misappropriation, that all obligations incurred comply with applicable laws and regulations, and that all revenues and expenditures pertaining to the incumbent's operation are promptly recorded and accounted for in accordance with Department of State procedures.
5. Uphold the Department of State's six core values (accountability, character, community, diversity, loyalty, service) and the Department's Leadership and Management Principles; observe and implement EEO principles.
6. Perform other duties as required and assigned.
7. Monitor and maintain the budget of the CMP05 accounting code.
8. Coordinate and network within the intelligence community to conduct and evaluate new technologies.
9. Continue development of Concept of Operations methodology to improve the TSC Branch programs.
10. Ensure active risk management through monitoring the security environment concurrent to the scope of official duties and responsibilities; follow security directives, regulations, and policies; safeguard classified information, material, and equipment.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:**

1. Continue training to improve skills as a SEO at the Interagency Training Center and the Diplomatic Security Training Center.
2. Perform and coordinate technical services in special posts falling under the aegis of the SCP and with other posts as required.

C. Describe any special circumstances influencing the work program.

**IV. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rater)**

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

**A. General Appraisal:**

All Employees: Performance was satisfactory or better (If no, see instructions for documenting unsatisfactory performance)

YES

☒

NO

☐

**B. Limited-Non-Career Appointees:**

Employee is recommended for extension if required by service needs.

YES

☐

NO

☐

**C. Discussion:**

Identify at least three of the work requirements including continuing responsibilities and/or specific objectives listed in Section III.

For each, using examples, describe the employee's performance and accomplishments.

Mark Lenzi has been a vital SEO in the TSC Branch. Mark is the TSC liaison to the Special Countermeasures Program. In this capacity he is one of a very few people in all of the Department to have Cryptographic Access and work on a daily basis on the Joint Worldwide Intelligence Communications System (JWICS) with Top Secret material as well as Special Access Programs (SAPs) that deal with some of the most sensitive technical security challenges facing U.S. embassies and consulates. Tenure as soon as possible and promotion to FS-03 are highly recommended.

Through his excellent substantive knowledge Mark advanced TSC's domestic and overseas security engineering agenda, and has provided outstanding technical support to Diplomatic Security and the U.S. government as a whole. As the Deputy Program Manager of Diplomatic Security's SCP, Mark has been particularly effective in cutting edge technical research and testing work with the JASON academic-intelligence advisory group, which brings together the brightest academics from U.S. universities with members of the Intelligence Community (IC) to work on some of the most complex physics and engineering challenges facing the U.S. government.

During this rating period, Mark worked with the JASON advisory group (working closest with two physics professors from Yale and Harvard Universities) and the IC to research, test, and solve a highly complex electrical engineering issue that was present at a U.S. government facility in a hostile country.

Mark also helped lead the planning and execution for a Diplomatic Security mission to a U.S. Government facility in a country with which the U.S. has difficult diplomatic relations. His work received praise from not only his colleagues from the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations (OBO) on the team, but also from American personnel assigned full-time to the facility. Mark flew directly from this mission and employed his excellent writing and oral briefing skills to report results and findings of the technical mission to members of the IC and JASON Advisory Group at a formal meeting in California.

Mark has, in a timely and pro-active manner, prepared written correspondence, reports, and telegrams on product evaluations for the SCP and has studied technical vulnerabilities of U.S. Government facilities and identified potential countermeasures. An obvious example of this is Mark's work to identify and evaluate a particular technical system that can act as a countermeasure to a particular threat facing U.S. missions worldwide. Mark conducted extensive research at the Top Secret level to identify and track the particular threat and then worked with various elements within the State Department and outside agencies (including the National Security Agency, Department of Defense, Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investigation) to test and evaluate the countermeasure. He then presented and demonstrated the countermeasure to senior IC management at an interagency exercise in the Washington, DC, area during this rating period.

Mark's substantive knowledge of technical security engineering issues and his practical, easy going work manner will be sincerely missed when he rotates out of TSC at the end of this summer to assume duties at Engineering Services Center in Frankfurt, Germany.

**V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. For Career Candidates only: Assessment of career potential as a Foreign Service Officer or Foreign Service Specialist:**

- ☐ Unable to assess potential from observations to date
- ☐ Candidate is unlikely to serve effectively even with additional experience
- ☐ Candidate is likely to serve effectively but judgment is contingent on additional evaluated experience
- ☒ Candidate is recommended for tenure and can be expected to serve successfully across a normal career span (see instructions)  
 (Support your choice by discussing below the candidate's potential for successful service across a normal career span, citing examples which illustrate strengths and weaknesses in each of the competencies cited below.)

**B. For all career candidates regardless of grade:**

For each of the competency groups listed below, draw on specific examples of performance to describe the rated employee's potential for advancement in the Service. (See Core Precepts for definitions of competencies.)

1. Leadership Skills 2. Managerial Skills 3. Interpersonal Skills 4. Communication and Foreign Language Skills  
 5. Intellectual Skills 6. Substantive Knowledge

**Note: This section should be left blank for Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs).**

Mark has all of the qualities that I believe will make for a successful career in the Foreign Service; therefore, he should be tenured and promoted to FS-03 at the earliest opportunity. The following are examples of his work in TSC that address each of the Department's Core Precepts:

As a team leader during a Diplomatic Security led mission to a critical threat post in Asia, Mark inspired a high level of performance and encouraged, developed, and rewarded efforts of his team members both during and after work to enhance their effectiveness. Mark won praise for his leadership efforts of the team he oversaw from Post management including the Regional Security Officer.

Mark excels in the area of Interpersonal Skills. His work during this rating period with Diplomatic Security technicians and engineers from other U.S. government agencies on cutting edge research for an Electrically Conductive Concrete (ECC) project was outstanding and is largely a testament to the close personal relationships he has forged with other engineers and technicians in the Intelligence Community.

Mark has excellent managerial skills as evidenced by his work during this rating period on a technical surveillance countermeasure investigation at a high profile post in Europe. Because of Mark's language, cultural, and work background in this particular country, he was sought out for technical advice on a possible technical penetration. Using his managerial skills, Mark sought out others in Diplomatic Security and the Intelligence Community with background knowledge of the particular country and familiarity with historical technical threats in the region and led an interagency meeting on the issue.

The communication and foreign language skills precept is an area where Mark distinguishes himself from many other Security Engineering Officers in that he has tested and is Language Incentive Pay (LIP) rated in the Russian language. During his time working in TSC Mark has been able to use his Russian language skills numerous times on TDY to Russia and has been called upon to translate for colleagues both in Russia and in Washington.

Mark's intellectual skills are profound and were continuously demonstrated during his time at TSC – a good example being when he was called upon to be the lead technical writer for a Diplomatic Security led interagency report on an electrical testing project that was conducted at a medium-sized post in Europe. Mark's writing was vibrant and concise, which was not an easy task given the highly technical nature of the report.

Perhaps Mark's strongest core precept is substantive knowledge, because he is able to formulate, through knowledge of physical and technical security issues, effective solutions to complex engineering challenges facing the TSC Branch while monitoring internal and external sources for information and ideas. Quite simply, Mark's security and technical knowledge combined with his language and cultural skills make him an extremely productive and effective member of the Foreign Service, generally, and DS, specifically.

C. **Areas for Improvement:** The following must be completed. Employees should be made aware of areas where they should concentrate their efforts to improve. Specify at least one area in which he/she might best direct such efforts. Area(s) cited must be explicitly linked to one or more of the competency groups listed in Section V B and must have been discussed with the employee in counseling during the rating period. Justify your recommendation with examples and indicate below competency group(s) being addressed. *(The response is not to be directed as a need for formal training.)*

Specify Competency Leadership Specify Competency \_\_\_\_\_

Mark should expand his leadership skills from leading Diplomatic Security technical teams to leading teams that also comprise security specialists from the U.S. military. He will have this opportunity when he serves as a Security Engineering Officer at Consulate Frankfurt with U.S. Navy Seabee security technicians.

## VI. REVIEW STATEMENT *(Completed by Reviewer)*

Assess the employee's performance and potential (if a career candidate, potential to serve across a normal career span - see instructions). Independent observations are encouraged and must be supported by additional examples of performance observed this rating period. Note differences with the rater's appraisal or recommendations. Comment on relations between rater and employee.

Mark Lenzi is an outstanding, well-rounded Foreign Service Specialist and has performed at a high level for the Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSC) Branch. His leadership and technical skills were crucial in ensuring a number of high priority projects were kept on schedule, and the branch was able to achieve bureau goals. I agree with the rater that he should be tenured and promoted to FS-03 immediately.

Much of TSC's work requires undertaking temporary duty assignments in countries that have difficult and often hostile diplomatic relations with the U.S. With his diverse technical and language skills, Mark has thrived working in these challenging environments while excelling in all of the Department's core precept areas.

During this rating period Mark effectively used his analytical and security engineering skills to test and evaluate a piece of high tech equipment that Mark identified as having a potential technical countermeasure capability. Mark proactively assembled a Diplomatic Security led interagency testing team that demonstrated the unique capabilities of the equipment against a significant technical security challenge facing the Department. Mark not only drafted an excellent memorandum for me recommending the procurement of the equipment, but also led a demonstration of the equipment for Intelligence Community (IC) management and briefed them on the results of the testing during a high level IC training exercise that I attended.

More than any other Security Engineering Officer during this rating period, Mark has worked the closest with the JASON advisory group on cutting edge, national-level, counterintelligence security issues. During this rating period he conducted a highly sensitive and technical mission to a critical threat post in Asia in conjunction with the Intelligence Community and then briefed an annual meeting of the JASON advisory group in La Jolla, California about his electrical testing work and details about the mission. For his efforts, he received a special commendation from the JASONS, which is a rare and prestigious honor.

Because of Mark's prior work in a particular country in Europe, he was called upon by a Regional Security Officer (RSO) to look into a technical issue at an embassy he was extremely familiar with. Mark used his security engineering knowledge, linguistic, and historical knowledge to lead an investigation into the issue. He also incorporated his extensive contacts in the IC to bring in appropriate technicians to work in a collaborative group effort that was appreciated and noted not only by the RSO but by members of the IC and Diplomatic Security management.

I have full confidence that Mark will have a highly successful career in the Foreign Service and would like to reiterate my support for SEO Wang's recommendation that he should be tenured and promoted to FS-03 as soon as possible.



**VII. STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE**

**A. Discussion:** This section is intended to provide the rated employee's views on the period of performance appraised. You must comment on your most significant achievements during the period. You may also address any activities or problems not adequately covered in this report, or aspects of the appraisal which need clarification or correction. Career Candidates are encouraged to state their current career goals including training and assignments desired over the next 5 years.  
*(Continuation sheets may be used.)*

Working with Diplomatic Security's Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSC) Branch this rating period has been one of my career highlights as collaborating to solve national-level technical security challenges has given me profound intellectual stimulation and job satisfaction. I would like to thank my rater and reviewer for mentoring me and providing me with numerous opportunities for professional and personal growth.

I feel that I am truly in my element as a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) as my work during this rating period has showcased my ability to combine my engineering background with my foreign language and cultural skills to advance the Department's security and diplomatic agenda.

Working with the JASON Advisory Group and the Intelligence Community (IC) on cutting edge national security technical issues has been a particular highlight for me during this rating period and I am extremely proud to have earned the respect and confidence of some of the United States' leading academics and IC personnel.

Leading the planning and execution of a Diplomatic Security mission to a consulate in a hostile country was particularly rewarding in that I was able to perform highly technical hands-on work and testing at this facility and then fly directly from this mission to brief members of the IC, JASON Advisory Group and the Department on my findings. To play such a leading role in solving high profile and pressing security issues facing the U.S. is but one example of why I feel that being a SEO for the Department is realizing a call to service and is truly how I am best able to utilize my unique skill set to advance American foreign policy goals.

Another example where my technical, language and cultural skills were used to great effectiveness by Diplomatic Security management was when I was called upon to lead a high level investigation into a possible technical penetration into an embassy in Europe I had unique familiarity with. The Regional Security Officer of the embassy relied on my linguistic skills to translate and evaluate technical items. I incorporated my historical and political knowledge of the country into my analysis and brought in key players from the IC into the investigation. My report on the investigation's findings won praise from DS management and my role in the investigation demonstrates how I am able to meld my technical, linguistic and cultural backgrounds to lead a high profile mission.

My efforts to identify and evaluate a technical system that can act as a countermeasure to a specific threat facing State Department missions worldwide have proved to be particularly gratifying. I coordinated an interagency research and development effort often working at the Top Secret level. I am extremely proud to have led a presentation team during this rating period that briefed the results of our research and demonstrated the countermeasure to senior IC officers and management at a senior level IC exercise.

Regarding short term goals, I hope to receive tenure and promotion to FS-03 this year and I very much look forward to my assignment as an SEO at Engineering Services Center Frankfurt, Germany, where I will have the opportunity to continue to advance the Department's security and diplomatic goals.

**B. I acknowledge receipt of this report.**

Date Section VII completed (mm-dd-yyyy)

05-28-2015

/s/ MARK LENZI

Employee's Signature

**PX-017**

See Instructions Before Completing

U.S. Department of State



# U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

## SUBMISSION CONTROL

DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-08-2015	DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-13-2015	DATE RELEASED TO DEPARTMENT FILES (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-13-2015
---	---	--

NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI)

LENZI, MARK R.

## TYPE OF REPORT

☒ REGULAR ☐ CAREER CANDIDATE ☐ LNA ☐ VOLUNTARY

 INTERIM: ☐ Change of Rater ☐ Duties ☐ Assignment

## GRADE

FS - 04

## SSN

XXX-XX-4434

## POSITION TITLE

SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER

## POST OR ORGANIZATION

324068 - FRANKFURT

## PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy)

From 09-18-2014 To 04-15-2015

RATER: KEMENY, GABRIEL

GRADE: FS - 01

TITLE: OFFICER IN CHARGE, ENGINEERING SERVICES CENTER

REVIEWER: BARELA, MICHAEL J.

GRADE: FE - OC

TITLE: REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR SECURITY ENGINEERING, EUROPE

After careful review, I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.

A. /s/ GABRIEL KEMENY

Rater's signature upon completion of Sections I, III, IV, and V

05-08-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

B. /s/ MICHAEL BARELA

Reviewer's signature upon completion of Section VI

05-08-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## I. CERTIFICATION - WORK REQUIREMENTS AND COUNSELING

Work requirements were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) 10-08-2014

If applicable, requirements were revised on (mm-dd-yyyy)

Rater and rated employee held counseling sessions to discuss performance on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)

1. 10-28-2014 2. 02-02-2015 3. 4.

In the case of an unsatisfactory performance rating, this is also to certify that the requirements of 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 (tenured employees), 3 FAH-1 H-2326 (employees subject to administrative promotion), or 3 FAM 2248 (FSO Career Candidates) have been met.

I certify that counseling sessions took place during the rating period and that at least one of them was documented in writing using the Counseling Certification Form (DS-1974).

/s/ GABRIEL KEMENY

Rating Officer

/s/ MARK LENZI

Rated Employee

05-08-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

## II. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)

A. **Examples of Performance:** Specific examples have been provided in all sections ☒ Yes (If not, return for rewrite)B. **Certification:** This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material.

05-13-2015

Date (mm-dd-yyyy)

MAUREEN C. YATES

Panel Chairperson's Name - Type

/s/ MAUREEN YATES

Signature

C. **Comments:** (If submitted late, indicate who is responsible for delay.)



**III. EMPLOYEE'S POSITION AND WORK REQUIREMENTS (Established by Rater, Reviewer and Employee)**

A. Describe the position and where it fits in the staffing pattern; indicate the number and kind of employees supervised or team affiliation(s) and tasking(s), whichever is applicable.

Mark Lenzi is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the U.S. Consulate General Frankfurt Engineering Services Center (ESC) under the Security Technology Operations (STO) Division within the Office of Security Technology (ST). Mark reports to the ESC Frankfurt Officer in Charge (OIC). He does not have supervisory responsibilities but on occasion may oversee the efforts of other SEOs, Security Technical Specialists (STs), contractors and U.S. Navy Seabees during specific projects.

B. Divide work requirements into two categories: continuing responsibilities and specific objectives (including, as appropriate, professional development activities), listing these in descending priority order.

**CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. Uphold the Department of State's six core values (accountability, character, community, diversity, loyalty, service) and the Department's Leadership and Management Principles; observe and implement EEO principles.
2. Practice security awareness; report and/or address possible safety hazards and/or unsafe practices; follow security directives, regulations, and policies; safeguard classified information, material, and equipment.
3. Manage the technical security needs of U.S. Embassy The Hague. Services include designing, installing and/or maintaining closed circuit television, intrusion detection, electric access control, emergency notification, tear gas, emergency destruction systems, perimeter protection systems, non-structural hardline door components, safe and lock repair, and lock combination changes.
4. Provide technical security services to ensure constituent posts maintain superior technical and physical security postures.
5. Provide technical security services for the Secretary of State and other high-ranking visitors in the region.
6. Coordinate headquarters-driven technical and physical security projects with posts, including Technical Security Upgrade (TSU) projects. Serve as a technical advisor during surveys to ensure that all issues are addressed. Monitor project development by reviewing scopes of work and drawing submissions. Oversee installations and conduct final project acceptance surveys.
7. As directed by the OIC, manage ESC sponsored technical security projects. Develop documentation necessary to define and justify the projects. Coordinate and schedule resources. Perform or oversee installations. Fully document all projects with written reports and as-built drawings.
8. Conduct technical security assessments (TSA) and technical security countermeasures inspections in accordance with Diplomatic Security (DS) guidelines and as directed by the OIC. Complete required reporting: TSAs, Engineering Service Reports (ESSR), trip reports, and on time vouchers.
9. Keep abreast of developments in technical security equipment, policy, procedures, and regulations. Interpret technical security standards for post personnel. Ensure technical security database data is complete and timely.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:**

1. Design and lead the installation of an Imminent Danger Notification System (IDNS) for U.S. Embassy The Hague.
2. Maintain ESC Frankfurt's Technical Security Countermeasures (TSCM) equipment and submit the yearly inventory.
3. Assist with the design and installation of an alarm system upgrade for U.S. Consulate General Amsterdam.
4. Conduct two TSCM inspections—one as a team member and one as team lead.

C. Describe any special circumstances influencing the work program.

**IV. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rater)**

For all Career Candidate employees and Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs)

**A. General Appraisal:**

All Employees: Performance was satisfactory or better (If no, see instructions for documenting unsatisfactory performance)

YES

NO

☒☐

**B. Limited-Non-Career Appointees:**

Employee is recommended for extension if required by service needs.

YES

NO

☐☐

**C. Discussion:**

Identify at least three of the work requirements including continuing responsibilities and/or specific objectives listed in Section III. For each, using examples, describe the employee's performance and accomplishments.

Mark has been an invaluable member of ESC Frankfurt while upholding the Department's six core values. Mark is currently filling an FS-02 position, and he has ensured that ESC Frankfurt has not only met but exceeded DS and the Department's goals through his well-rounded, flexible, and innovative approach to challenging security engineering issues in high visibility posts such as U.S. Embassy The Hague. He augmented his impressive technical ability with outstanding interpersonal skills that stressed team building. Mark should be promoted to FS-03 and tenured at the earliest opportunity.

During this rating period, Mark demonstrated his engineering and technical prowess by leading the design and installation of an Imminent Danger Notification System (IDNS) for U.S. Embassy The Hague. Demonstrating his collaborative skills, Mark led the IDNS design and installation team comprising of SEOs, STSs, Seabees, Regional Security Officers (RSOs), and the local Regional Security Technician (RST). Mark solicited input for his design while taking into account The Hague's unique physical and technical security requirements. Mark also took the lead on physically setting up and programming the system at post with the aforementioned team members assisting him. Because the installation required coordination with Washington and a high level of technical skill, Mark led the coordination efforts with the DS Command Center and made sure appropriate DS personnel monitoring the situation were briefed on the installation.

After the successful installation of the IDNS system, Mark then demonstrated his outstanding communication skills by briefing the Marine Security Guards (MSGs), RSOs, local Dutch security guards, and the RST on how to operate the system – especially in a high stress environment if the embassy is under attack. Mark won praise from the RSO for not only the successful implementation of the engineering design and layout of the system, but for the time he took to thoroughly brief all security personnel. This advanced not only post's immediate and future security needs but DS's overarching security goals as well. From the ESC's perspective, I valued that Mark was proactive in sharing his lessons learned from the Inovonics system installation with other SEOs as well as STSs and Seabees back in Frankfurt, which in turn, led to successful installation upgrades of this system at other posts in the region.

Mark parlayed his responsibilities of managing ESC Frankfurt's TSCM equipment into improved security engineering work performance in conducting TSCMs, in not only the European (EUR) region but the Near Eastern Affairs region as well. Often working under tight deadlines with highly specific technical and classified work requirements, Mark demonstrated outstanding managerial and customer service skills through his support in coordinating the classified pouching of equipment to posts in the EUR region and beyond. Drawing on his profound experience in conducting TSCMs prior to his arrival at ESC Frankfurt, Mark is able to advise SEOs on the best TSCM equipment to use for their specific requirements at their post. In fact, Mark specifically was requested by SEOs in the field to help them conduct TSCMs because they value his expertise in this area, his easy-to-work-with manner, and his collaborative skills. Mark further demonstrated his TSCM skills during this rating period by playing a crucial role on a TSCM inspection conducted at a high profile embassy in the EUR region. He briefed other members of the team on the proper use of a particular piece of highly technical equipment and then worked with them directly to familiarize them with the equipment's unique technical requirements and nuances.

In addition to being the lead SEO for U.S. Embassy The Hague, a high profile and up tempo post in the EUR region, Mark's efforts to provide excellent engineering service to support security operations at U.S. Consulate Amsterdam should also be noted. Mark not only assisted with the engineering design for an alarm system upgrade for the consulate but also accomplished numerous highly physical technical tasks, including assisting Seabees drill out a steel door to provide an emergency exit lock. Mark's eagerness to not only be involved in high level engineering security design issues, but to get his hands dirty with actual physical security implementations has led to increased office cohesion in the ESC, which is greatly appreciated by DS and Seabee management.

**V. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. For Career Candidates only: Assessment of career potential as a Foreign Service Officer or Foreign Service Specialist:**

- ☐ Unable to assess potential from observations to date
- ☐ Candidate is unlikely to serve effectively even with additional experience
- ☐ Candidate is likely to serve effectively but judgment is contingent on additional evaluated experience
- ☒ Candidate is recommended for tenure and can be expected to serve successfully across a normal career span (see instructions)  
(Support your choice by discussing below the candidate's potential for successful service across a normal career span, citing examples which illustrate strengths and weaknesses in each of the competencies cited below.)

**B. For all career candidates regardless of grade:**

For each of the competency groups listed below, draw on specific examples of performance to describe the rated employee's potential for advancement in the Service. (See Core Precepts for definitions of competencies.)

1. Leadership Skills 2. Managerial Skills 3. Interpersonal Skills 4. Communication and Foreign Language Skills  
5. Intellectual Skills 6. Substantive Knowledge

**Note: This section should be left blank for Limited Non-Career Appointees (LNAs).**

Mark greatly increased his substantive knowledge of overseas DS security engineering regulations and practices by his collaborative efforts to study and research security engineering challenges and then implement highly technical and innovative solutions that comply with DS standards. His efforts to increase his knowledge of nuances of the Inovonics IDNS deserve particular praise in addition to his efforts to increase his engineering knowledge of various types of systems including closed circuit television, intrusion detection, electric access control, emergency notification, tear gas, emergency destruction systems, perimeter protection systems, non-structural hardline door components, and safe and lock repair.

Mark demonstrated impressive leadership skills during an almost three week specialized TSCM mission to a high visibility embassy in the region. Being the only member of a 15 strong team that had used a particular piece of highly technical counterintelligence equipment, Mark not only took the lead in the use of the equipment itself, but more importantly, taught other SEOs how to use this equipment; he achieved this orally briefing them and then working with them directly on the unique technical requirements and nuances of this particular piece of highly sensitive equipment. Mark continually demonstrated his leadership skills when acting as Duty Officer for ESC Frankfurt. In one particular instance, Mark calmly helped the Deputy RSO of Consulate Frankfurt coordinate an emergency response with the Regional Director of Security Engineering of ESC Frankfurt in a case involving violence against a U.S. citizen with a significant German police response. In another instance he proactively put together a Duty Officer Standard Operating Procedure for access rights and keys expressly for working after hours and on weekends.

Mark set a high standard for managerial performance in performing Security Management System enterprise (SMSe) computer hardware and software upgrades at numerous posts in the EUR region. He established and clearly communicated performance expectations in accordance with the Department's goals and objectives with Seabees, RSTs, RSOs, and contractor support staff in Washington. Mark has performed the most SMSe upgrades at ESC Frankfurt this rating period and has been able to share his knowledge with DS security personnel both at ESC Frankfurt and at posts in the region. This support has won praise from numerous RSOs.

Mark's interpersonal skills are outstanding and set the standard for integrity and workplace behavior in our office. Mark has fostered a work place climate based on mutual respect and trust, whether it is out in the field participating in SMSe, alarm or IDNS upgrades, or by organizing team building activities for ESC Frankfurt such as touch football games. The latter is an example where Mark invited colleagues from another U.S. government agency to participate in ESC football games he organized, and this relationship led to increased technical collaboration between the ESC and this particular U.S. government agency thus advancing overall DS security goals.

In addition to his aforementioned interpersonal skills, Mark exhibits full mastery of written communication as demonstrated by the well-argued Engineering Security Services Reports (ESSRs) that he wrote in a succinct and efficient manner on various engineering security subjects such as TSCM reports or TSAs for posts in the ESC Frankfurt region.

Mark demonstrated high-level intellectual skills during this rating period, especially when acting as the ESC's Duty Officer. During these numerous times, he had to develop fast response times to emergency security situations, such as an employee being locked out or an alarm that was responding to input. Mark is able to calmly and judiciously prioritize a rank order of tasks that need to be completed, and he often coordinates a response with the head of Facilities in Consulate Frankfurt along with others outside of the ESC such as MSGs. Mark also is an active participant in security and technical training provided by ESC Frankfurt.



C. **Areas for Improvement:** The following must be completed. Employees should be made aware of areas where they should concentrate their efforts to improve. Specify at least one area in which he/she might best direct such efforts. Area(s) cited must be explicitly linked to one or more of the competency groups listed in Section V B and must have been discussed with the employee in counseling during the rating period. Justify your recommendation with examples and indicate below competency group(s) being addressed. *(The response is not to be directed as a need for formal training.)*

Specify Competency Communication & Foreign Lang Specify Competency \_\_\_\_\_

Mark should seek out temporary duty assignment opportunities in the EUR and South and Central Asian regions to further hone and practice his 2/2+ Russian language skills which would benefit his work for Diplomatic Security in the regions that ESC Frankfurt covers.

#### VI. REVIEW STATEMENT *(Completed by Reviewer)*

Assess the employee's performance and potential (if a career candidate, potential to serve across a normal career span - see instructions). Independent observations are encouraged and must be supported by additional examples of performance observed this rating period. Note differences with the rater's appraisal or recommendations. Comment on relations between rater and employee.

Mark Lenzi demonstrates breadth of skill and knowledge in his work within Europe. Success as both a Security Engineer and as a member of the Foreign Service is dependent on achievement, especially in work abroad. I believe Mark has reached that level this year, and I expect him to have a very successful career in the Foreign Service.

The first criteria I look for in a successful officer is the ability to perform well in design and implementation of technical security systems at U.S. missions. Mark successfully integrates with his team members in Frankfurt to solve daily maintenance and repairs; for example, opening a damaged classified container or by leading other Security Engineers on projects such as comprehensive Technical Security Assessments of embassies and consulates. His delegating style for such work sets a positive tone for operations. Likewise in The Hague, Mark's post support and systems installations solicited numerous messages of superb customer support from post management. His implementation of enhanced video recording equipment in Frankfurt was completed ahead of schedule due to Mark's knowledge of the Department's Security Management System network. Mark performed network and infrastructure upgrades in facilities ranging from a small U.S. Delegation building to the U.S. Embassy Copenhagen to the large U.S. Consulate General in Frankfurt.

I also look at an officer's ability to work well in embassy and consulate environments. Mark has excellent relations with his supervisor Gabriel Kemeny. They work together to provide excellent customer service to their missions. Mark's interactions with Regional Security Officers and Front Office personnel have been outstanding. Mark's collaborative style allows Gabriel to select Mark as team lead and to mentor incoming first-tour officers. As a Duty Officer this year, Mark displayed exceptional leadership and discretion during a domestic issue involving another consulate employee. He contacted me, provided a situation briefing, and was available to assist me in handling the issue with the Regional Security Office staff.

Mark definitively shows he is an excellent officer and essential member of the Frankfurt Engineering Services Center. His accomplishments provide concrete examples of his career success. I endorse the rating officer's recommendation for tenure now and promotion.

**VII. STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE**

**A. Discussion:** This section is intended to provide the rated employee's views on the period of performance appraised. You must comment on your most significant achievements during the period. You may also address any activities or problems not adequately covered in this report, or aspects of the appraisal which need clarification or correction. Career Candidates are encouraged to state their current career goals including training and assignments desired over the next 5 years.  
*(Continuation sheets may be used.)*

I am gratified and proud to be such an integral member of the Engineering Services Center (ESC) in Frankfurt, Germany and would like to thank my rater and reviewer for their mentorship and recommendations for tenure and promotion to FS-03. It is highly rewarding to be challenged on a daily basis with complex technical problems that need to be solved quickly and efficiently. I am grateful that my work during this rating period at the U.S. Consulate Amsterdam for an alarm upgrade project, countermeasures survey and an access denial project among other work was considered so professional and vital that the Regional Security Officer (RSO) in Amsterdam nominated me for the Department's Franklin Award.

The FS-02 position that I am filling in Frankfurt is challenging and multifaceted; I am not only responsible for all of the technical security needs for U.S. Embassy The Hague, a high tempo embassy with unique security requirements, I have also thrived in managing ESC Frankfurt's Technical Security Countermeasures (TSCM) equipment for the EUR region and am responsible for the yearly inventory and logistics (diplomatic pouching, etc.) of millions of dollars worth of highly complex equipment deployed in the EUR, NEA and SCA regions.

I believe one of my best strengths as a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) is my versatility as I am as comfortable trying to solve a complex electrical engineering issue in a fast paced embassy as I am with doing intense physical labor such as pulling fiber optic cable.

I am proud that I have brought a well-rounded skill set and background to ESC Frankfurt that has added to team camaraderie and cohesion. I have gone out of my way to include U.S. Navy Seabee technicians in work activities at U.S. Embassy The Hague and have also made it a priority to include them in after work activities I have organized such as football games that bring together various agencies from Consulate Frankfurt. These activities I have arranged have not only been appreciated by the wider consulate community but have led to much closer work collaboration between Diplomatic Security personnel and other U.S. Government agencies at the consulate.

It has also been gratifying to continue to hone my foreign language skills this rating period. For instance, in March I read an article in a Polish newspaper about an issue that had the potential to immediately impact certain technical functionality at U.S. Embassy The Hague. I raised the issue and its potential implications to the Regional Security Office (RSO) team at U.S. Embassy The Hague and requested they monitor a possible corresponding technical issue. I have consistently earned praise from the RSO team at The Hague and from others in Diplomatic Security for my well-rounded work approach and for products such as this that comprise multifaceted disciplines.

My long term goals remain the same as when I joined the Foreign Service: to continue to better myself and help the Department create a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the American people. Regarding short term goals I hope to receive tenure this year and be promoted to FS-03. I look forward to further honing my technical and management skills over the next year and then serving as Officer in Charge at an Engineering Services Office.

**B. I acknowledge receipt of this report.**

Date Section VII completed (mm-dd-yyyy)

05-08-2015

/s/ MARK LENZI

Employee's Signature

**PX-018**





## U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

I. SUBMISSION CONTROL			
DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-02-2016		DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 05-11-2016	
NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI) LENZI, MARK R.		GRADE FS-04	EMPLOYEE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 157155
TYPE OF REPORT Regular	POSITION TITLE SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER	POST OR ORGANIZATION FRANKFURT	PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy) From 04-16-2015 To 04-15-2016
RATER - NAME, TITLE KEMENY, GABRIEL OFFICER IN CHARGE ENGINEERING SERVIC		RATER GRADE FS-01	REVIEWER - NAME, TITLE BARELA, MICHAEL J. REGIONAL DIRECTOR SECURITY ENGINEERI
I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.			
Signature of Rater after completion of Sections II, V, and VII /s/ GABRIEL KEMENY		Date 05-02-2016	Signature of Reviewer after completion of Section VIII /s/ MICHAEL BARELA
Date 05-02-2016			
II. CERTIFICATION OF WORK RESPONSIBILITIES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS			
Work responsibilities were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) <u>12-15-2015</u>			
Rater and rated employee held performance review sessions on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)			
1. <u>10-07-2015</u> 2. <u>02-25-2016</u>			
III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT (Completed by Rated Employee)			
I acknowledge receipt of this report, which has been completed for submission to a review panel.			
Signature of Rated Employee /s/ MARK LENZI			Date 05-02-2016
IV. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)			
A. Examples of Performance: Have specific examples been provided in all sections? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
B. Certification: This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
C. If this report is submitted late or does not conform to regulations and instructions, indicate who is responsible:			
Signature of Panel Chairperson /s/ PETER CROWTHER		Name of Panel Chairperson PETER N. CROWTHER	Date 05-11-2016
V. POSITION DESCRIPTION, RESPONSIBILITIES, SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES			
<b>Position Description:</b> Size and function of the work unit and its position within the Mission or Bureau, number of employees rated and reviewed, amount and purpose of financial and physical resources for which the employee is accountable. Mark Lenzi is a Security Engineering Officer (SEO) in the U.S. Consulate General Frankfurt Engineering Services Center (ESC). Mark reports to the ESC Frankfurt Officer in Charge (OIC). He may on occasion oversee the efforts of other personnel during specific projects.			
<b>Core Work Responsibilities</b> <b>Model the Department of State's six core values (accountability, character, community, diversity, loyalty, service) and the Department's Leadership and Management Principles; observe and implement EEO principles.</b> <b>Security Responsibilities:</b> Ensure active risk management through monitoring the security environment concurrent to the scope of official duties and responsibilities; follow security directives, regulations, and policies; safeguard classified information, material, and equipment.  Manage the technical security needs of U.S. Embassy The Hague. Services include designing, installing and/or maintaining closed circuit television (CCTV), intrusion detection, access control, emergency notification, tear gas systems, emergency destruction systems, safe and lock repair, and lock combination changes. <b>Goals/Specific Objectives:</b> List in priority order the outcomes the employee seeks to achieve in support of Mission, Bureau, or Department goals. 1. Assist with the hiring of a new Post Security Technician (PST) at U.S. Embassy The Hague. 2. Participate in at least one Technical Surveillance Countermeasures (TSCM) assignment where, in addition to normal work activities, he also trains other personnel on a new advanced piece of technical equipment. 3. Participate in at least one Counter Intelligence Working Group (CIWG) meeting convened by the Regional Security Officer at U.S. Embassy The Hague			



**V. POSITION DESCRIPTION, RESPONSIBILITIES, SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES - CONT.**

**Special Circumstances:** Unusual, unexpected or unpredictable circumstances that significantly altered operational conditions.

**VI. DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rated Employee)**

**Describe your individual and collaborative accomplishments that advanced the Department's mission.**

This rating period I have strived to apply my management and foreign language abilities in addition to my technical and engineering skills to bring a well-rounded approach to challenges confronting Engineering Services Center (ESC) Frankfurt. As the only Security Engineering Officer (SEO) at ESC Frankfurt with Cryptographic Access and a professional knowledge of the Russian language, I have been called on numerous times to work on some of the most sensitive technical security issues facing U.S. embassies and consulates in the EUR, SCA and AF regions which has contributed to enhancing the safety and technical security of diplomatic facilities and State Department personnel.

Honing my management skills, I played a leading role in the recruitment and hiring process for a new Post Security Technician (PST) for U.S. Embassy The Hague. I led the process in identifying potential American candidates with security clearances as well as interviewing prospective technicians. This was a complex endeavor given the complicated local Dutch labor laws and unique technical requirements of the job. Working with U.S. Embassy The Hague Human Resources officers and the RSO Office, I led efforts to train our new PST and the results so far of his work have been spectacular by all accounts from embassy management.

Due in large part to my communication and management skills, I was selected to be the Chairman of multiple EER Review Panels during this rating period which involved extensive written and verbal coordination with other panel members. On numerous occasions I identified inadmissible comments and worked with the employee to not only mitigate and correct language but to strengthen the overall writing quality of the EER. I won praise from Consulate General Frankfurt's management for ensuring that my fellow panel members were educated with written and video informational materials on EER review tips.

I have earned plaudits from Diplomatic Security (DS) management for my efforts to train SEOs in the latest counterintelligence technology – whether that be by proactively organizing a presentation for eight SEOs at ESC Frankfurt or by training SEOs individually as part of temporary duty missions to U.S. Embassy Copenhagen and U.S. Embassy N'djamena; the latter culminating in a Franklin Award nomination from my supervisor.

One of the aspects of my job that I have enjoyed the most during this rating period is advising the Regional Security Officer (RSO) of U.S. Embassy The Hague on technical counterintelligence threats facing U.S. interests in The Netherlands. As part of these efforts, I led preparations and planning for an interagency Counterintelligence Working Group (CIWG) that focused on urgent cyber security issues facing U.S. government missions in The Netherlands. In addition, I was called upon to brief the U.S. Ambassador to The Netherlands on specific counterintelligence threats to U.S. interests in The Netherlands and the EUR region as a whole.

**VII. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. Appraise the employee's accomplishments in the areas of informational, operational, and relational effectiveness. Cite specific policy and programmatic outcomes and their impact on the Department's mission.**

During this rating period SEO Lenzi performed at an even higher level than last year, particularly in managing the technical security needs of U.S. Embassy The Hague. As the SEO who oversees technical security for The Hague, Mark supervises the maintenance of video, alarm, access control, emergency notification and perimeter protection systems as well as classified safe and lock repair. Mark's attention to detail and ingenuity in maintaining these complex technical systems has allowed Embassy The Hague as well as Consulate General Amsterdam (where he received a Franklin Group Award for technical guidance to the Regional Security Officer in June 2015) to operate and process classified material at a high tempo in a fast paced political, diplomatic and commerce environment.

On temporary duty (TDY) assignments to Moldova and Ukraine, Mark was able to demonstrate not only technical proficiency by operating the latest technical counterintelligence equipment in challenging environments but also incorporated his Russian language skills to discern and adjudicate possible intelligence threats. This use of his language skills contributed to the overall success of the missions thus furthering Department security goals.

Because of his managerial skills and customer service attitude, Mark was one of only two Foreign Service specialists selected in the ESC to be consular duty officer for U.S. Consulate General Frankfurt, the largest U.S. consulate in the world. During his week of consulate duty, he assisted numerous American citizens find lost relatives, assisted on hospitalization and emergency care cases, deaths, repatriations, visa issues and lost passports. His handling of and reporting on these often complex and stress inducing cases won praise from Consulate General Frankfurt management



because it contributed to greater overall consular outreach and responsiveness thus fulfilling an overarching Department of State goal.

A good example of Mark's well rounded and inclusive work style is when I selected him for a special interregional counterintelligence mission to N'Djamena, Chad in part because of his proficiency with a piece of technical equipment that few SEOs have experience operating. Once in Chad, Mark was called upon to brief the Ambassador on the overall inspection mission as well as the aforementioned piece of equipment that he was using in the Ambassador's office. The briefing went so well that the Ambassador requested to be debriefed by Mark at the conclusion of the inspection.

In addition to his normal duties with the technical inspection mission, Mark proactively worked with the Marine Security Guards (MSGs) in Chad on identifying the cause of an issue they were having with the Imminent Danger Notification System (IDNS). The Regional Security Officer (RSO) was so impressed with Mark's ability to identify the underlying cause of the problem and his overall knowledge of the system that she requested that Mark teach the weekly MSG School that week on the IDNS system. Mark received praise from the RSO for his ability to teach a highly technical system to twelve Marines in a clear and concise fashion.

One of the aspects of Mark's performance in Chad that most pleased the Ambassador and the RSO was his pro-active nature to work with another U.S. Government agency to lead and perform a full technical inspection of their classified work space in the embassy, something that is not normally done by SEOs on a mission of this nature. Mark's efforts in this regard saved the U.S. Government tens of thousands of dollars and led to enhanced technical security cooperation between the Department and this particular government agency.

Mark's performance in an FP-02 position this rating period - including when he has been Acting Officer in Charge of ESC Frankfurt, the largest overseas security engineering office in the Department of State - has only improved over last year when he received an MSI and I highly recommend him for promotion to FP-03.

**B. Developmental area: Competency that needs the greatest strengthening to entrust employee with greater responsibilities. Cite example(s) from the current rating period.**

**Specify competency** Substantive Knowledge

While Mark experienced some work on access and alarm systems, he should make an effort to involve himself in more such projects to expand his knowledge of them. A more thorough understanding of such systems will allow him to better manage both the systems and the resources it takes to maintain them.

**C. Rater's Summary Judgment**

**For All Employees: Was performance satisfactory or better?** Yes ☒ No ☐

**For Untenured Employees:**

- ☐ The career candidate is likely to perform effectively across a normal career span
- ☐ Additional development and observation is needed
- ☐ The career candidate is unlikely to perform effectively even with additional experience

**VIII. REVIEW STATEMENT (Completed by Reviewer)**

**Assess the rated employee's preparedness for positions of greater responsibility, citing examples of performance. Describe the employee's relations with the rater, peers and subordinates.**

This year, Mark Lenzi continues to provide superior protection of U.S. missions in Europe. Rocked by terrorism in Brussels, neighboring embassies and consulates required security assessments to ensure protection. Review by Diplomatic Security management showed Mark's conscientious security support for The Hague and Amsterdam ensured security during the heightened threat. Mark continues to be a leader in counterintelligence for my engineering services offices in Europe. He provided extended countermeasures support to an African post. Mark also instructed Security Engineering Officers at training here in Frankfurt. His expertise in leading technical counterintelligence missions led to his selection by the bureau for an interagency exercise in Virginia later this year. Mark and his rater, Gabe Kemeny, have a very strong and productive relationship. Gabe has placed Mark in charge of the Engineering Services Center several times this year. Mark's oversight provided continuity in European security operations.

Mark demonstrates his acumen for working within the consulate community. He is an integral member of the First and Second Tour officer group. His volunteerism at the consulate Fourth of July event ensured the success of this key outreach event. Mark volunteers to chair employee evaluation panels on behalf of human resources. His work provides assessments ready for the employee evaluative process, key to State's workforce development program. Mark also volunteered as the post duty officer for Consulate General Frankfurt. Fielding numerous American citizen inquiries and coordinating timely responses, he was the public face for the mission for a week. Mark is an integral part of our regional support for diplomatic missions in Europe and he will be missed after he departs to assume duties in Guangzhou, China this summer. His strong performance rates my recommendation for promotion by this year's panel.

IX. PERFORMANCE PAY (For SF Only - Completed by Rater)

Assess Performance keyed directed to the Performance Pay Criteria.

X. OPTIONAL STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE

The rated employee may use this section to address activities or problems that the Rater or Reviewer did not adequately cover or aspects of the report that he or she believes should be clarified or corrected. Continuation sheets may be used.

**PX-019**





## U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT

I. SUBMISSION CONTROL				
DATE RECEIVED IN POST/BUREAU (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-25-2017		DATE RECEIVED IN HR/PE (mm-dd-yyyy) 04-25-2017		
NAME OF EMPLOYEE BEING RATED (Last, First, MI) LENZI, MARK R.		GRADE FS-03	EMPLOYEE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 157155	
TYPE OF REPORT Regular	POSITION TITLE SECURITY ENGINEERING OFFICER	POST OR ORGANIZATION BEIJING	PERIOD COVERED (mm-dd-yyyy) From 08-11-2016 To 04-15-2017	
RATER - NAME, TITLE BLANTON, PHILLIP H. OIC ESO GUANGZHOU		RATER GRADE FS-02	REVIEWER - NAME, TITLE LIM, EUN J. RSO GUANGZHOU	REVIEWER GRADE FS-03
I consider this report to be complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documented by specific examples of performance.				
Signature of Rater after completion of Sections II, V, and VII /s/ PHILLIP BLANTON		Date 04-25-2017	Signature of Reviewer after completion of Section VIII /s/ EUN LIM	
			Date 04-25-2017	
II. CERTIFICATION OF WORK RESPONSIBILITIES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEWS				
Work responsibilities were established by rater, reviewer, and employee on (mm-dd-yyyy) 09-22-2016				
Rater and rated employee held performance review sessions on at least two dates as follows: (mm-dd-yyyy)				
1. 09-21-2016 2. 01-03-2017				
III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT (Completed by Rated Employee)				
I acknowledge receipt of this report, which has been completed for submission to a review panel.				
Signature of Rated Employee /s/ MARK LENZI				Date 04-25-2017
IV. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT (Completed by Review Panel)				
A. Examples of Performance: Have specific examples been provided in all sections? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
B. Certification: This report has been prepared according to the regulations and contains no inadmissible material. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
C. If this report is submitted late or does not conform to regulations and instructions, indicate who is responsible:				
Signature of Panel Chairperson /s/ JOSEPH ZADROZNY		Name of Panel Chairperson JOSEPH E. ZADROZNY		Date 04-21-2017
V. POSITION DESCRIPTION, RESPONSIBILITIES, SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES				
<b>Position Description:</b> Size and function of the work unit and its position within the Mission or Bureau, number of employees rated and reviewed, amount and purpose of financial and physical resources for which the employee is accountable. The position is within the Engineering Services Office (ESO) Guangzhou, China, a field element of Diplomatic Security that applies technology to protect the people, information, and property at U.S. Consulate Hong Kong and U.S. Consulate Guangzhou. The position supervises the ESO logistician and \$2.5 million dollars of inventory.				
<b>Core Work Responsibilities</b> <b>Model the Department of State's six core values (accountability, character, community, diversity, loyalty, service) and the Department's Leadership and Management Principles; observe and implement EEO principles.</b> <b>Security Responsibilities:</b> Ensure active risk management through monitoring the security environment concurrent to the scope of official duties and responsibilities; follow security directives, regulations, and policies; safeguard classified information, material, and equipment.  Provide technical security services to ensure posts maintain a superior technical and physical security posture. Manage ESO sponsored technical security projects. Develop documentation necessary to define and justify the projects. Coordinate and schedule resources. Conduct Technical Security Assessments (TSA) within the region. <b>Goals/Specific Objectives:</b> List in priority order the outcomes the employee seeks to achieve in support of Mission, Bureau, or Department goals. 1. Provide policy guidance, perform inspections, and draft official correspondence for the three security upgrade projects in the region. 2. Kickoff phase 2 of the Technical Security Upgrade at U.S. Consulate Hong Kong. Identify the issues that must be addressed with post management or Washington. 3. Oversee the annual technical security equipment inventory reconciliation. 4. Complete the monthly reporting and administer the security networks and countermeasures unique to Mission China.				

**V. POSITION DESCRIPTION, RESPONSIBILITIES, SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES - CONT.**

**Special Circumstances:** Unusual, unexpected or unpredictable circumstances that significantly altered operational conditions.

**VI. DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Completed by Rated Employee)**

**Describe your individual and collaborative accomplishments that advanced the Department's mission.**

This rating period I was nominated to be Security Engineering Officer (SEO) of the year and I have thrived in a challenging technical security environment in Guangzhou while upholding the Department's six core values. I have not only met but exceeded the Department's goals through a well-rounded, flexible, and innovative approach to challenging security engineering issues not only in Guangzhou but in our high tempo constituent Consulate General Hong Kong. I have augmented my technical ability with interpersonal skills that stress team building.

Demonstrating my collaborative skills, I led an investigation into a high profile facility issue affecting a consulate in the EAP region which required not only technical ability but coordination among Locally Employed Staff, American contractors, management and facility officers, as well as SEOs, Security Technical Specialists (STSSs), Seabees and Regional Security Officers (RSOs). I solicited input for my investigation while taking into account this particular consulate's unique physical and technical security requirements. I also took the lead on coordinating the investigation with consulate management and Washington and made sure appropriate DS personnel were fully briefed.

I parlayed my responsibilities of managing ESO Guangzhou's technical counterintelligence equipment into improved security engineering work performance in conducting technical counterintelligence surveys in the EAP region. Often working under tight deadlines with highly specific technical and classified work requirements, I demonstrated managerial and customer service skills through my technical support of a high profile U.S. mission where my unique background and skill set on a particular issue meant that Washington specifically requested my assistance not only because of my expertise in this area but because of my easy-to-work-with manner, and my collaborative skills. I briefed the RSO and members of the Senior Foreign Service about the technical issue of concern and outlined mitigation solutions to be undertaken.

Besides leading technical counterintelligence efforts for Consulate General Guangzhou, I have also played a key role in providing prompt engineering service to support security operations at U.S. Consulate General Hong Kong where I have helped manage two concurrent and complex technical security team upgrades for specialized door enhancement and comprehensive alarm system installation. Personnel at each post have appreciated that I have not only helped manage and oversee the teams and implemented high level engineering security design issues, but have also gotten my hands dirty side by side with upgrade team members by, for example, pulling electrical wire for an installation.

In addition to my technical work and project management, one of the things I am most proud of is my teambuilding efforts to build cohesion and camaraderie among the RSO section and the Marine Security Guards. I have organized consulate flag football games that have not only increased esprit de corps within these two key consulate sections but among the consulate as a whole including local staff and members of the wider consulate community.

**VII. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL (Completed by Rater)**

**A. Appraise the employee's accomplishments in the areas of informational, operational, and relational effectiveness. Cite specific policy and programmatic outcomes and their impact on the Department's mission.**

SEO Mark Lenzi's performance is excellent in all areas and his potential for advancement and achievement in the Foreign Service is high. He volunteered for a complex assignment at the American Institute in Taiwan Taipei Office (AIT/T) that required broad knowledge of 12-FAH-6 technical security policy, managed the security programs and reporting requirements unique to Mission China, and served as the Officer in Charge of the ESO on many occasions. As the officer responsible for ESO Guangzhou's logistics activity, Mark effectively supervised a logistics manager by designing meaningful work requirements and setting reasonable goals. Throughout the year the ESO hosts dozens of visitors from within the region and from Washington, D.C. Mark is the control officer for these visits, sets the agenda, and organizes meetings with post management. He ensures that the Regional Security Officer (RSO) is kept informed of all matters that impact security. This requires Mark's awareness on all maintenance and construction work that affect the building's security systems. For example, Post's facilities maintenance staff assumed that frequent rain storms and a low water table was causing flooding in the buried conduits and manholes that support the consulate's electrical and security systems. It was through Mark's commitment to solving this problem that Post identified the real reason for this potentially catastrophic hazard. By analyzing the drainage pattern of 36 manholes, he located the problem and then had the water chemically analyzed to find its source. Results pointed to a water leak in the consulate's main supply line as the primary cause of the problem. By correlating this evidence to high water utility bills, Mark got management to see the importance of the problem. When Post was experiencing problems with the fire alarm system, Mark was the RSO's expert advisor. He took part in the repair process by attending meetings, consulting with the experts, and then briefed the RSO as to the cause of the problem and the fix. He explained the complexities of

the fire alarm problem to stakeholders in the region and Washington, D.C. and proposed solutions to correct it. It was Mark's comprehensive written and verbal communications that persuaded headquarters to send a team of fire alarm experts to repair the problems. By submitting after-action Engineering Security Survey Reports to the right DS offices in Washington, D.C., Mark ensured that records of these incidents were retained. Mark is the lead SEO for U.S. Consulate General Hong Kong's Technical Security Upgrade (TSU), a year-long multi-million dollar project that modernized every security system at post. He ensured that Post management understood the contract's deliverables and the projects impact on daily operations. He approved contractual changes, heavily scrutinizing costs and time constraints, and supplemented the project with ESO labor and material in order to keep the project within budget. Because Mark became familiar with every aspect of the project's scope of work and corrected contractual gaps before they surfaced, we are expecting an on-time and within-budget completion. I appreciate that Mark set a high standard for managerial performance by managing and rating the ESO logistician. It was this collaborative relationship that led to the success of this year's security equipment inventory reconciliation. Unlike previous years, a TSU project added and removed hundreds of pieces of security equipment that all had to be accounted for. Mark oversaw a team of ESO staff that counted thousands of installed and in-stock items and corrected the inaccuracies. This task demonstrated Mark's attention to detail, teamwork, and leadership skills.

**B. Developmental area: Competency that needs the greatest strengthening to entrust employee with greater responsibilities. Cite example(s) from the current rating period.**

Specify competency Managerial Skills

SEO Lenzi must be more perceptive of when and how to use the chain of command and limit his participation with problems outside the ESO's area of responsibility. In such cases, Mark must only advise in the ESO's areas of responsibility and use the chain of command to alert outside parties.

### C. Rater's Summary Judgment

**For All Employees: Was performance satisfactory or better?** Yes ☒ No ☐

**For Untenured Employees:**



The career candidate is likely to perform effectively across a normal career span



Additional development and observation is needed

4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527
---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

The career candidate is unlikely to perform effectively even with additional experience

### VIII. REVIEW STATEMENT (Completed by Reviewer)

Assess the rated employee's preparedness for positions of greater responsibility, citing examples of performance. Describe the employee's relations with the rater, peers and subordinates.

In his eight months at post, Mark Lenzi has not only demonstrated his excellent technical and managerial skills but also has made significant contributions to post morale. Mark is well-liked by his colleagues – subordinates, peers and supervisors alike. Mark shares an excellent collaborative relationship with his rater and is well on his way to performing at an FP-02 level and should be promoted at the next opportunity.

This rating period, I have been impressed with Mark's excellent technical and managerial skills – particularly when he was Acting Officer in Charge of the Engineering Services Office performing a technical investigation for our Consulate on a high profile security and facility issue and when he assisted on an interagency emergency repair that required coordination with Beijing's Regional Security Office and multiple government agencies in Washington.

Mark also demonstrates excellent communication skills whether he's drafting technical Concept of Operations documents used in sensitive countermeasures activities or briefing members of high profile delegations on specialized countermeasures and facility infrastructure installation for high risk facilities.

Mark's professional capabilities are undeniable, but what makes him stand out are his contributions to the larger consulate community and post morale. He has organized popular consulate touch football fundraising games that raise money for our consulate's Marine Security Guard Detachment's annual ball and has led to greater cohesion amongst all our consulate sections. We are very lucky to have an officer of Mark's caliber who is an invaluable member to our consulate's security and morale.

IX. PERFORMANCE PAY (For SFS Only - Completed by Rater)

Assess Performance keyed directly to the Performance Pay Criteria.

X. OPTIONAL STATEMENT BY RATED EMPLOYEE

The rated employee may use this section to address activities or problems that the Rater or Reviewer did not adequately cover or aspects of the report that he or she believes should be clarified or corrected. Continuation sheets may be used.